

Gift of

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary
OF THE
Evangelical Lutheran Church
AT CHICAGO
Maywood, Illinois

Division I

Class 5.

Shelf

Ac. Vol. 10301.

Presented by the
Rev. Henry Warren Roth, D. D., LL. D.

No.

RB III 6

THE
EVANGELICAL
Quarterly Review,

EDITED BY

M. L. STOEVEY, LL.D.,
Professor in Pennsylvania College.

VOLUME XX.

Property of
CBPL
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library


GETTYSBURG:

J. E. WIBLE, PRINTER, NORTH-EAST COR. OF WASHINGTON & R. R. STS.

1869.

v. 20

1869



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

INDEX TO VOL. XX.

- Abbott's Jesus of Nazareth, 310.
 Allibone's New Testament, 476.
 Anderson's Foreign Missions, 474.
 Angels, 221.
 Annals of the American Pulpit, 304.
 Atkinson's Garden of Sorrows, 313.
 Augsburg Confession, Art. IV, 481.
 Barnes' Notes on Psalms, 154, 474.
 Bates' History of Pennsylvania Volunteers, 314.
 Baugher, Rev. H. L. Art. by 221.
 Beach's Christian Worker, 630.
 Beck, Translation from, 418.
 Bellows' Old Word, 158.
 Bickersteth's Hades and Heaven, 312.
 Bonar's Light and Truth, 313.
 Bourdillon's Parables, 313.
 Bushnell's Moral Uses of Dark Things, 156.
 Bushnell's Women's Suffrage, 639.
 Butler's Ecclesiastical History, 311.
 Cazin's Phenomena of Heats, 477.
 Chatrian's Conscript, 477.
 Chatrian's Waterloo, 477.
 Cheever's Pilgrim's Progress, 310.
 Christian Church, 418.
 Christian Sabbath Vindicated, 475.
 Codex Sinaiticus, 71.
 Communion with God, 556.
 Conflict in the Church, 58.
 Conrad, Rev. V. L., Art. by, 304.
 Conybeare's St. Paul, 311, 474.
 Craik's English of Shakespeare, 477.
 Coulin's Discourses, 637.
 Cuyler's Empty Crib, 156.
 Daniel and his Prophecies, 579.
 Day's English Literature, 477.
 Death and the Intermediate State, 161.
 Dodge's Evidences of Christianity, 312.
 Dox, Rev. H. L., Art. by, 565.
 Draper's History of the Civil War, 157.
 Ecclesiastical Purity, 565.
 Ehrehart, Rev. C. J., Art. by, 194.
 Ewer's Sermons, 312.
 Experience and Practice necessary in Religion, 35.
 Fairbair's Revelation of Law in Scripture, 153.
 Faith, Nature and Efficacy, 194.
 Fish's Pulpit Eloquence, 637.
 Foreign Missions, 1.
 German Colony in Maine, 440.
 Gobright's Recollections, 476.
 Golden Links, 311.
 Good Angels, 221.
 Greeley's Recollections, 476.
 Greenwald's Questions on the Gospels, 639.
 Gross, Rev. J. B., Art. by, 50, 401.
 Hall's Care Cast upon the Lord, 475.
 Hamilton's Pearl of Parables, 157.
 Haven's Studies, 476.
 Henderson's Commentary on Jeremiah, 154.
 Henkel Paul, Reminiscences of, 387.
 Hodge on the Confession, 638.
 Holman, Rev. S. A., Art. by, 58.
 Hopkins' Law of Love, 312.
 Hoppin's Christian Ministry, 636.
 Huntingdon's Gropings after Truth, 157.
 Hutter's Compend of Lutheran Theology, 155.
 Jacobs, Rev. H. E., Art. by, 125, 524.
 Jacobus' Notes, 637.
 Justification by Faith, 481.
 Kahle, Dr., Translation from, 597.
 Karn, A. J., Reminiscences of, 396.
 Ker's Sermons, 310.
 Keys, The, 269, 341.
 Krauth, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 94.

- Labouchre's Illustrations of Luther, 309.
 Lacy's Holy Eucharist, 476.
 Lacroix's Religion and Reign of Terror, 313.
 Leifchild's Remarkable Facts, 639.
 Lillie's Lectures on Peter, 309.
 Little Effie's Home, 640.
 Lord's Supper, 401.
 Lossing's History of the Civil War, 314.
 Loy's Martin Luther, 639.
 Loy's Doctrine of Justification, 639.
 Lutheran Doctrine of the Sabbath, 125.
 Lutheran Church in the United States, 113.
 Lutheran Church in Maine, 440.
 Lutheranism before Luther, 255.
 Luther's House-Postil, 639.
 Macduff's Noontide at Sychar, 313.
 March's Night Scenes in the Bible, 312.
 Martin, J. N., Reminiscences of, 381.
 M'Clintock's Cyclopædia, 154.
 M'Cosh's, Dr., Works, 153.
 Melchisedec, 50.
 Memorial of Hartwick Seminary, 155.
 Miller, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 35.
 Miller's Life, 638.
 Mission of Lutheran Publication Society, 462.
 Moehler's Symbolism, 157.
 Muller's Chips from a German Workshop, 639.
 Nevius' Life in China, 478.
 Newton's Bible Wonders, 640.
 Notices of New Publications, 153.
 309, 474, 636.
 Oberlin, Life and Labors, 18.
 Opium Habit, 313.
 Order of Worship, 79, 233.
 Outlines of Old Testament History, 475.
 Patrick Henry, 611.
 Peters, Rev. G. N. P., 269, 340.
 Pohlman, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 440.
 Porter's Human Intellect, 154.
 Power's Pivot Words, 157.
 Publication Society, 462.
 Reformation, its Occasion and Cause, 94.
 Relation of the Text to the Sermon, 597.
 Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers, 381.
 Sabbath, Lutheran Doctrine of, 125.
 Sabbath Question, 524.
 Sacramental Presence, 317.
 Schaff's Christ in Song, 475.
 Shively's Cottage by the Lake, 509.
 Seiss, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 79, 233, 579.
 Seiss' Plain Words, 475.
 Selah, Meaning of the Word, 217.
 Sermonizing, 291.
 Severinghaus, Rev. J. D., Art. by, 597.
 Smiley's Who is He? 311.
 Smith, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 556.
 Smith's Incidents of the Christian Commission, 475.
 Smith's Old Testament History, 638.
 Special Mission of Lutheran Pub. Society, 462.
 Sprague, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 611.
 Sprague's Annals, 304, 310.
 Surgeon's Evening by Evening, 475.
 Stuckenberg, Rev. J. H. W., Art. by, 462.
 Stuckenberg's History of the Aug. Confession, 309.
 Text, its Relation to the Pulpit, 597.
 Thomas, Rev. C., Art. by, 317.
 Three Hundred Years Ago, 155.
 Traver, Rev. A., Art. by, 363.
 Tucker's Gospel in Enoch, 311.
 Ulrich Zwingli, 156.
 Valentine, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 481.
 Van Alstine, Rev. N., Art. by, 194.
 Wadsworth's Sermons, 474.
 Watchwords from the Warfare of Life, 156.
 Weiser, Rev. R., Art. by, 255.
 Whitney's Last Passover, 311.
 Will, The, 363.
 Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, 311.
 Wingard, Jacob Reminiscences of, 393.
 Wolf, Rev. E. J., Art. by, 418.
 Ziegler, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 209.

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXVII.

JANUARY, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

By G. A. LINTNER, D.D., Schoharie, N. Y.

The spirit of our religion, is a spirit of universal benevolence. It draws out the heart in sympathy and love for all our fellow creatures, and disposes us to do good unto all, as we have opportunity. This spirit, it is true, does not embrace all indiscriminately. It does not disregard the distinctions of character between the good and evil, the righteous and wicked. There is a peculiar complacency, with which true Christians love each other as believers in Christ, and members of the same spiritual family; but besides this holy affection, every Christian has a feeling of universal benevolence; he loves all his fellow creatures as members of the great human family. No man can possess this spirit without having his heart enlarged. While he is doing good to the world at large, he feels that he is engaged in a great work—that he is an instrument, in the hands of the Great Benefactor of the human race, of diffusing his blessings over the whole earth; and in per-

forming this sacred duty of his high calling in God, the Christian experiences a delight, which can only proceed from a benevolent heart. This spirit is essential to true religion. It is indispensable to the spread of the gospel and the conversion of the world. And yet how few of the professed disciples of Christ have imbibed this spirit, and faithfully cherish and cultivate it in their hearts? How many are there, who appear to feel but little interest in the great work of benevolence, which Christ has enjoined on his followers. He has commanded his disciples to "Go and teach all nations—to preach the gospel to every creature"—and yet the majority of those who profess to believe in his name, and to obey his gospel, either stand entirely aloof from the great work of evangelizing the world, or do very little to promote it. Some even appear to doubt, whether they are under obligation to do any thing for the spread of the gospel through the world. They are opposed to Foreign Missions; they feel willing to support the gospel at home, but they are not willing to send it abroad; and when they are urged to this duty, they have many objections, which they consider sufficient for withholding the gospel from the heathen. They have an idea that they have enough to do to support the gospel among themselves, and propagate it in their own country; and that they are not required to send it out into foreign lands. This is the ground assumed by many in the Church, as well as out of it. We propose to examine this ground in the present discussion. We shall state some of the objections urged against Foreign Missions, and show that these objections cannot be sustained on the principles, laid down in the gospel of Christ, and the obligations resting on Christian.

1. "The heathen are satisfied with their religions, and so long as they are contented, and desire no change, why should we interfere, and attempt to force on them a religion which they do not want." This objection seems to regard all religions with equal indifference; it places them on the same footing, without discrimination. It makes no distinction between truth and error, and supposes it a matter of little importance which is selected, if the people only are satisfied. It assumes that Christianity is no better than Paganism, and that there is nothing in the Gospel of Christ to render it preferable to the systems of error and delusion, prevailing in heathen countries. This is a false assump-

tion. It exhibits Christianity in a false light, a light, in which it is too apt to be viewed by men, who have no more regard for the Gospel of Christ, than for the Koran of Mohammed, or the Shasters of the Hindoos. And it is not at all wonderful, that persons who entertain such views of Christianity should care but little, whether the heathen are saved by the Gospel, or left to perish without it. The objection rests on a false basis. It is not a matter of indifference what kind of religion a people embraces, if they are only satisfied. The religion which we seek to propagate among the heathen is one, which differs from all others, that have ever been propagated on earth. It is the only true religion in the world. It is distinguished from all other systems, by the convincing power of its evidences. It carries with it a demonstration that it comes from heaven with a divine power to save sinners, who cannot be saved in any other way. It is the only effectual method of recovering our lost race from the power and influence and punishment of sin. It is the power of God unto the salvation of all who believe and embrace it. And in this, it differs from all other religions in the world. It is the religion which all men need, and the only one that can satisfy them when they are made sensible of their true condition and wants. We know that the heathen generally are satisfied with the religions which they have derived from the traditions of past ages, and to which they have been accustomed for many generations, but we know also, that this arises from the ignorance which is in them, and the blindness of their hearts. They know nothing of the Christian religion. They have never seen its light—they are in darkness, and cannot see the difference between Christianity and Paganism. If they could, they would not be satisfied. As long as they are laboring under the delusion of the prince of darkness, it is not strange, that they should be satisfied with their false systems of religion. It is the natural and necessary result of their ignorance of the true light which God has revealed in the Gospel. And is this a reason, why we should withhold the Gospel from them, and leave them in darkness to perish without the light? If anything could induce us to seek their deliverance, it should be the consideration, that they are satisfied with their wretched condition, and desire no change. To see our fellow creatures suffer, when they are sensible of their condition, is distressing—but it is

much more distressing to see them in such a state, when they appear wholly insensible themselves. It is like the maniac shut up in a lunatic asylum, satisfied with his condition, and desiring no change. While bereft of his reason, suffering the greatest calamity which can befall a human being, he imagines himself the the happiest creature on earth. We look upon him as a poor sufferer, deserving the greater compassion, because he is laboring under such a delusion. So, also, we should look upon the heathen with greater commiseration, because they are laboring under a delusion which seems to have taken away all sense of the wretchedness of their condition. If we have any bowels of compassion—any feelings of benevolence, we surely should pity those who seem to have no pity for themselves—and if they should be insensible, or even prove ungrateful, we shall have the high satisfaction of having done something for the relief of our suffering fellow creatures.

2. "The heathen can never be converted. They are so closely wedded to their religious systems, and so strangely opposed to Christianity, that they cannot be induced to change." This objection is often put forth with great confidence, and especially by men who are not much acquainted with missionary operations. They say, the heathen are more strangely attached to their religion than we are to ours—that they would rather die, than renounce the worship of their gods, and that it is unreasonable to suppose, that they can be converted to Christianity. Such are the grounds of the objection. Let us examine them, and then look at the facts disclosed in the history of missionary operations. We admit, that the heathen are strangely attached to their religion. They are ready to perform any service, or render any sacrifice to gain the favor of their gods. A rich Hindoo, not long since, gave twelve hundred thousand dollars to one of his idols. Another spent one hundred thousand dollars on a single heathen festival. This shows how ready they are to devote their property to objects connected with their religious worship. Nothing is considered too precious to be given up as a sacrifice. They even sacrifice their lives. Thousands and tens of thousands have offered themselves as victims before the Car of Juggernaut, or on the banks of the river Ganges, or in the fires of the Suttees, that they may manifest their zeal and attachment to their re-

ligion. In this, they are a standing reproof to us, who are so much more highly favored in religion than they, and evince so much less zeal and devotedness. But after all, the heathen can be turned from their idols. With all their devotedness to their religion, their hatred and opposition to Christianity, they can be converted, truly and thoroughly converted from heathenism to Christianity, and the only means, by which this can be effected, is the Gospel. There is a power in the Gospel which prevails against all opposition, and this power has been felt and acknowledged by thousands of the heathen, who have been brought under its sanctifying and saving influence—to prove this we will refer to facts:

Ever since the days of the Apostles, the first Christian missionaries, the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen has been progressing. Multitudes have been converted from every nation and kindred and language, and the great body of believers in the Church now, are Gentile converts, the descendants of heathen ancestors. Since the commencement of modern missionary operations, which is now about seventy years, it is estimated, that three thousand missionaries have been sent out to the heathen by Protestant Christians from different parts of the world. We have now about two thousand in the field. We number six hundred churches and three hundred thousand converts. This is the result of our foreign missionary labors for the last seventy years. And although this result is far less, than might have been accomplished, if Christians had been more active and zealous in the cause, still it shows that the Gospel is capable of producing an impression on the heathen, and that it has proved to be the power of God unto the salvation of multitudes, that have been gathered into the Church. On the first Sabbath in July, 1838, seventeen hundred and five heathen converts were baptised and received into the Church by the Rev. Titus Coan, an American missionary at the Sandwich Islands. This occurred in one day. It was a day like the day of Pentecost, and like that remarkable season, it should ever be preserved in the records of Christianity. The missionary, who baptised these converts, says, that on that same day, he administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to twenty-four hundred communicants, and that during the year, five thousand converts were added to the Church. Forty-five years ago, the

Sandwich Islands were covered with pagan darkness. The people were ignorant and wretched idolaters. Now we have twenty thousand Christians there, who support the Gospel among themselves, and raise large contributions every year to send out the Gospel to other heathens, that they also may be saved. In India and in China, where at the commencement of the present century Protestant Christianity was scarcely known, we now have flourishing missionary stations, schools, seminaries and churches, where thousands of the heathen have been brought from the surrounding darkness, under the light and influence of the Gospel. In Western Asia, the power of the Gospel has also been displayed in a more remarkable manner. Whole communities, who were living under the form of Christianity, and yet dead, have been awakened and hopefully converted through the instrumentality of our foreign missionaries. In Africa, along the shores of the Mediterranean, and among the West India Islands, wherever the Gospel has been faithfully preached, its power has been felt in the hearts of many who were once bitterly opposed to it, but who have been constrained to yield to its heavenly and divine influence.

Such are the facts connected with the preaching of the Gospel in heathen countries. And what do these facts prove? They prove most conclusively, that there is no ground for the assertion, that the heathen cannot be converted by the Gospel. No intelligent person who knows anything of missionary operations, will make such a declaration; for it cannot be supported. It is a question no longer to be disputed, whether the heathen will receive the Gospel, or whether they can be benefited by it, or not. This question is settled. It is a fact established by the observation and experience of all, who have been engaged in missionary operations, that there is a power in the Gospel to turn the hearts of the heathen, and save their souls from the darkness, pollution and sin, under which they are laboring. In every part of the world, where the Gospel has been preached, heathens have been converted—and every one that has been converted has been a living witness of the power of the Gospel, and can testify to its saving influences. We have the testimony of the New Zealand warrior, rising in the midst of a group of children, assembled for Christian instruction, and saying to the teachers: "Let me speak—I must speak—O that I had

known that the Gospel was coming—that such a blessing was in store for me—then I should have saved my children, and they would have been among this happy group to-day—but I have destroyed them all, and have not one left.” Then bursting into tears, and cursing the gods, whom he had served, he continued: “It was you, that infused the savage disposition into me to murder my children; and now I shall die childless, though I have been the father of nineteen children.” Rev. Mr. Coan, to whom we have already referred, gives the following testimony to the power of the Gospel, displayed in the heathen converts, whom he gathered into the Church: “Among this throng,” says he, “you will see the hoary priest of idolatry, with hands but recently washed from the blood of human victims, together with the thief, the adulterer, the sorcerer, the man-slayer, the highway robber, the bloodstained murderer, and the mother; no the monster, whose hands have reeked with the blood of her own offspring. All these meet together before the Cross of Christ, with their enmity slain, and themselves washed, and sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God.”

Such are the displays of the Divine power of the Gospel among the most degraded and wicked of our race. Such are the fruits of missionary labor among the heathen. Who, then, will pretend to say, that it is useless to send out missionaries, and that the work, to which they are devoted, is impracticable? Who, after viewing these facts, and many others that might be stated, will doubt the success of an enterprise, which God has owned and blessed in the salvation of so many souls, that were once lost in heathenish darkness and corruption.

3. “The time for the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen, and the conversion of the world has not yet come.” Here we might ask in the first place, who has told these men who raise this objection, that we are premature in the work of Foreign Missions? How do they know, that the time for the conversion of the heathen has not yet come? Has this time ever been fixed? Has it been limited to any particular period? Does any one know precisely when it is to begin, how long it is to continue, and when it will end? Do the prophecies give any definite information on this point? They predict the universal diffusion of the Gospel among the nations of the

earth, but they do not specify the particular day, or year, when this prediction shall be fulfilled. We are aware that some expositors have attempted to fix the time, when the Jews shall be converted, and the fulness of the Gentiles brought in—but this is all conjecture, and these conjectures are mere speculation. There is as much doubt and uncertainty about the time of the fulfillment of the prophecies now, as ever. We know from the clear teaching of the Word of God, that there will be a time, when the Gospel will be given to all the world. We have reason to believe that the time is approaching—but when it will come, no one knows. This is one of the secret things belonging to God. And no one has any authority for saying, that the time for Christians to exert themselves for the evangelisation of the world has not yet come. The circumstances of the times, and the events which have recently transpired, are unquestionably favorable to the prosecution of Foreign Missions. There never was a period in the history of the world, which held out stronger inducements for Christians to labor in this cause. Such a door of access to the heathen never was opened before. The open and violent opposition of heathen notions has in a great measure ceased. Obstacles that have impeded the progress of Christianity for ages are removed, and the time has actually come, when the way has been prepared for Christian missionaries to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. Facilities for social and Christian intercourse are constantly and rapidly increasing—the means of communication between different parts of the earth are daily multiplying. Missionaries can now be conveyed to any portion of our globe, with less expense, and greater safety, than at any former period. The Bible is working its way through the world. Tracts are distributed in almost every language. Missionary associations, schools and seminaries are established in all Christian countries, and even in heathen lands, to raise up missionaries for the conversion of the world. If ever there was a time for the friends of the Redeemer to make united and strenuous efforts for the conversion of the world, that time is now. And no intelligent Christian can view the indications of God's providence in our day, without feeling a deep interest in the foreign missionary cause, and an earnest desire to promote it.

4. "We have heathen enough at home." This is a very

common objection, and many persons who make it do not understand its import. They do not know what it is to be a heathen. If they did, they would not be so ready to make this objection. A heathen is a person totally ignorant of the true God. One who worships idols—who has never seen a Bible, or heard of the Saviour. He knows nothing of the Gospel, or the way of salvation revealed in the Scriptures. Now, where will you find a person in this Christian land, who will answer the description? Where is the man in a Christian community, who, with all his ignorance, and prejudice, and opposition to God and religion, has not some idea of the true God, and some sense of obligation to serve Him? Where, among the multitude living in sin, seemingly regardless of their duty to God, and their souls, do you find any, who have never been brought under some kind of religious influence? Where are the heathen among us who have never heard of the Bible—who know nothing of the truths of Christianity, and the Sabbath, and the worship of the true God? Where in the land of Gospel light are the heathen temples, filled with bloody sacrifices, and surrounded by the bones of slaughtered victims? Where do you see the people flocking together by thousands and tens of thousands for the worship of a senseless block of wood, or a hideous graven image, or gathering around the bloody car, or rushing to the funeral pile, yelling and shouting, urging on the victims of idolatry to self-destruction and immolation? Where do you witness such scenes in this country? We have no such heathen. With all our infidelity and irreligion, we are still blessed with the light of Christianity, and with this glorious light shining among us, we have no such heathen, as there are in India, and China, and Africa, and those dark regions where the light of the Gospel does not exist. The assertion, therefore, that we have heathen enough at home is unwarrantable, and can never be admitted as an objection to Foreign Missions.

The same can be said of an idea, which is closely connected with this objection, that we have enough to do to support the Gospel among ourselves, and that we cannot send ministers into foreign lands, without a sacrifice to the interests of our Churches at home. If such were the effects of Foreign Missions, there might be some weight in the objection—but even then it would be our duty rather to make the sacrifice, than suffer the heathen to be lost in

their present state. But we cannot for a moment admit the idea that Foreign Missions involve such a sacrifice. Facts show that it is otherwise. Churches that have been most interested in Foreign Missions, have enjoyed the greatest prosperity. They have been most successful in promoting their own interests. We have never heard of a Church being injured by contributing to the support of Foreign Missions—but we know of churches and individuals who injured themselves by withholding their support from the cause. They actually became too poor to support the Gospel among themselves, and thus afforded a striking illustration of the truth of that declaration of Scripture: "There is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." (Prov. 11 24.) Who are the most active and successful supporters of the interests of religion at home? Are they not those who are most zealously engaged in the work of Foreign Missions? Is it not a fact well known to every intelligent Christian, that the spirit of Foreign Missions has been favorable to the churches among whom it has prevailed? Has it not increased vital piety, and given a new impulse to the spirit of benevolent enterprise, which should prevail in every Church? Nothing has occurred within the last fifty years, that has proved so great a benefit to our churches, as the revival of the spirit of Foreign Missions. Let us not speak of sacrifices in the cause of Foreign Missions. If we have made any, we have been more than compensated. For every dollar we have sent out, we have received more than ten times its value in return. For every missionary that has gone forth, we have had an additional supply of faithful pastors at home. In the language of an experienced and judicious writer on this subject, we say, that the Church cannot do without the spirit of Foreign Missions, for it is this spirit, that gives life and energy to all those holy principles of action, by which alone it can be sustained.

5. "Whenever God shall see fit to convert the heathen, He can do it without our assistance." That God can convert the heathen or execute any other purpose, which He may see fit without human instrumentality, no one will deny. By his almighty power he can raise up missionaries, and send them forth, and spread his Gospel through the world, without the aid or co-operation of any of his servants. But will He do it? Will he convert the hea-

then without these means which he has always employed in the work? The conversion of the heathen is no new thing. It has been going on since the Gospel began to be preached on the earth. God has always employed his servants as instruments in the work, and it is doubtless His will, that they should still engage in it, as such. God is a Sovereign, and can do whatever he pleases without the agency of man, but in every work committed to our hands in which his glory, and the good of mankind are concerned, we have a duty to perform, and we have no reason to expect, that the work will be accomplished, unless that duty has been discharged. The power and sovereignty of God do not take away our agency in the matter, nor can they excuse us for the neglect of any duty. Christ has commanded us: "Go and teach all nations." This is a work committed to our hands. It is the will of God, that his people should carry the Gospel to the heathen, as the means of their salvation. It is true they cannot be saved without the Divine blessing upon the means employed, but the means must be used, or the end will not be accomplished. The command of Christ is clear and positive. It removes all doubt, answers every objection, and sweeps away every excuse. Men may be opposed to Foreign Missions, and feel themselves justifiable in their opposition, but this cannot alter their obligation in the matter. As long as the command of God appears on the record of the Bible, without any condition or qualification, there can be no excuse; no ground of justification, no apology for any man, who refuses to obey the command and authority of Jehovah.

Having noticed these objections, we shall now proceed to state briefly a few considerations to encourage the friends of Foreign Missions in their efforts to send the Gospel to the heathen.

The first ground of encouragement which we will mention, is the conviction, that it is the work of the Lord. This conviction is essential to the success of the missionary enterprise. All who would enter into the true spirit of this enterprise, must have this conviction thoroughly impressed upon their minds. They must feel that they have devoted themselves to a work very different from those schemes of worldly enterprise, in which men are engaged for selfish ends. If we were engaged in such a scheme, we could not expect to succeed. The obstacles in

the way of the propagation of the Gospel through the world, are too formidable to be overcome by men, engaged in selfish pursuits. It would be impossible to convert the world by a mere human device. The missionary enterprise is no such device. It does not depend on the power and wisdom of the world for support. It rests on a stronger basis—the power of the Almighty; it is the work of the Lord, and He will carry it on. With this conviction Christians should enter into this work. They should labor and pray with the full assurance, that it must succeed, and finally triumph over all opposition. God has given this assurance to his people. He has promised them to convert the world, and though there are many obstacles in the way of the fulfillment of this promise, the Lord will accomplish his purpose. The work is His, and He will perform it. He has pledged himself, that he will support His people in their efforts to accomplish his designs. And if they are faithful in his work, they may rest assured, that He will not suffer them to labor in vain. There may be much in the present state of the world to try the faith of the friends of the missionary cause; they may see many difficulties in their way, and sometimes feel discouraged in view of the difficulties, still they have no reason to doubt the promises of God. The great Redeemer is on the throne, and He must rule, till all his enemies shall be put under his feet. His promises can never fail. He will perform his covenant engagements. He will never leave nor forsake his people, in the prosecution of his work. He will be with them always, even unto the end of the world. This great truth is cheering to the hearts of those, who labor in the missionary cause—and had they nothing else, this would be sufficient to encourage them in the arduous and difficult work, in which they are engaged. With such encouragement, we should deem no sacrifice too great in this benevolent and holy enterprise. We should be wholly consecrated to it; and when we see obstacles in the way, obstacles which to us may seem insurmountable, we should press forward with confidence in the power of God, and faith in his promises.

Another consideration which should encourage the friends of Foreign Missions in their efforts, is the increased attention which has been awakened to the subject. When we look at the spirit of Christianity, the universal love it inculcates, the activity and zeal which it demands in

the service of Christ, and the dissemination of his Gospel among men, it does seem strange, that there should be a Christian in the world, without the missionary spirit. And yet there have been many such; men eminent in piety, willing to render any sacrifice in the cause of Christ, and who have even suffered martyrdom, have evinced but little interest for the salvation of the heathen. Even during the Reformation, when the minds of men were so powerfully awakened on the subject of religion, the claims of the dying heathen were almost wholly disregarded. And in the subsequent periods, when God poured out his Holy Spirit on his people, and awakened them to a sense of their obligations in so many other respects, they still remained insensible in regard to their duty in this cause. How few possessed the spirit of Elliot, and Cotton Mather, and the Mayhews, and the Brainerds who went out as missionaries to the heathen, and faithfully labored for their salvation. But this spirit which remained so long dormant in the Church, has been re-awakened. After a long night of darkness, the light has re-appeared, and is now going forth, and giving a new impulse to Christianity in all our Protestant churches. May the light spread, until all who profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ shall feel its awakening power! May the missionary spirit be revived in all our hearts, and lead us to consecrate ourselves more fully to the great work of evangelizing the world!

The last consideration which we shall mention as a ground of encouragement for Christians to devote themselves to the missionary cause, is the success which has attended the labors of those who have been engaged in the work. It is indeed remarkable, that so much impression should have been produced by the preaching of the Gospel among the heathen, when we consider the small number of missionaries that have been sent out. It is estimated that the three thousand missionaries who have labored among the heathen for the last seventy years, have been the means of converting three hundred thousand souls—that is at the rate of one hundred for each missionary. When we compare this result with the effects produced by the preaching of the Gospel in our own country, does it not appear strange, that any of us should have doubts in regard to the success of Foreign Missions, and the duty of supporting them? Where are the pastors of our churches at home that have been more useful in their

fields of labor, than the missionaries who have gone out among the heathen? There may be some such—but the instances are few. When we look at the difference in the circumstances connected with the preaching of the Gospel in Christian and heathen countries, we believe, we are authorized in saying, that God has blessed the labors of foreign missionaries equally with the ministers who have labored in the domestic field. We should therefore regard it as a Christian duty to support foreign missionaries in their labors, as well as the ministers who labor among us—and if the suspicion has ever entered our minds, that the interests of our churches at home, are opposed to the foreign missionary cause, we should divest ourselves of it, as entirely groundless. The interests of both are to be regarded as one and the same. God looks upon them as such, for He bestows his blessing equally on both. He has closely connected them in the scheme of human salvation, and made them mutually dependent on each other. Why should we make any distinction, and seek to separate them? We should love them both, and pray the Great Head of the Church to send out more laborers into both fields, that the precious harvest, ready to be gathered at home and abroad, may not be lost.

These considerations should lead us to inquire, whether we have imbibed that missionary spirit, which Christians in our day must possess, if they would be properly qualified for the high and important duties they are called to discharge. The foreign missionary enterprise is a great work. It has for its object the restoration of a fallen world—the salvation of eight hundred millions of our fellow creatures, all lost in sin and in the power of the adversary. Have we of the Lutheran Church in this country considered this work in all its importance? Do we feel that interest in it now, when the work is languishing on our hands, which Christians who profess to love God and their fellow creatures ought to feel? What have you done to promote this object? Have you obeyed the command of God our Saviour: “Go and teach all nations?” Have we done our duty in this cause? Have we prayed for its success? Have we contributed to its support—and have our prayers and alms come up for a memorial before God? Have they been such a sacrifice as God will accept? Can any of us conscientiously say in the presence of God, who searcheth out hearts, “I have done my

duty to the heathen?" Until we can say so, we should not rest satisfied. We should feel, that we have yet much to do, to come up to the high standard, at which Christians should aim in our day. And if any of us have imbibed a missionary spirit; if that holy fire has been kindled in our hearts, let us beseech God, that it may be nurtured into a flame, and burn brighter and brighter, until it shall divest us of all selfishness, and prejudice, and worldliness, and enable us to bring our whole hearts as a willing sacrifice, as a pure offering to God in this holy cause. And let us remember that it is not only a duty but a privilege to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick and administer comfort and consolation to the distressed. There is a satisfaction, a high satisfaction in the thought, that we have done something for the relief of suffering humanity—that we have been the means of sending a blessing on them who were ready to perish, and of causing the widow's heart to sing for joy. It is more blessed to give than to receive. To give in such a cause, is to lend unto the Lord. It is to make ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. What we give is not lost. It is like casting our bread on the waters, and after many days we shall find again. It will come back to us, good measure, pressed down, shaken together and running over. All that we lay out for Christ and his cause, is like laying up for ourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and thieves do not break through and steal.

This is a work in which we should all unite. Every one should do his share, and if some cannot do as much as others—if the poor cannot bring the same offering with the rich, they should not withhold the sacrifice which God has enabled them to bring. He has given us all the ability to do something. For this we should be thankful, and we should remember, that the property which God has bestowed upon us, is a means of doing good. We should honor God with our substance—and when we do so, property becomes a blessing in our hands. Instead of attaching us more closely to the world, it draws us nearer to God. And this is the great secret of Christians rendering themselves happy, by the very means which lead others into misery. Money in the hands of the wicked is the root of all evil. In the hands of the Christian, it is the means of doing good to himself and others. Let us remember this; and if we have never known this secret, let

us learn in our day. For in our day Christ, our Divine Master, the friend of sinners, who died to redeem a lost world, comes to us with the claims of that perishing world for which he rendered such a precious sacrifice, and demands a sacrifice from us. He asks us to give something for the souls of the poor heathen, whom he purchased with his blood. Let us honor God with our substance. Let us open our hearts freely and liberally to the claims which the Saviour presents to us, and we shall know what it is to enjoy prosperity, if we have never known it before.

We know the preciousness of the Gospel. As Christians, we profess to have experienced its power in our own hearts. We owe it to the world—and shall we withhold it from those who are perishing, when we know that it is the only means of saving them? The time is short, and what we mean to do for the salvation of the heathen, must be done quickly. Soon we shall be called to render an account of our stewardship at the bar of God. May we not be among the number of those, to whom the Judge shall say: "I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat; thirsty, and ye gave no drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in: naked and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not; inasmuch as ye did it not to one of these, for whom I shed my blood, ye did it not unto me." May none of us incur such a condemnation in the great day, when we shall stand in the presence of God with an assembled universe! If the heathen perish through our neglect, we shall be held responsible. Their blood will be required at our hands. God has placed the means for their salvation in our hands, and we are bound to use those means, that the end may be accomplished.

If there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, let us follow the example of Christ, and be like-minded, and we shall one day share in the glorious recompense, which He will bestow on those who evince their love and attachment to Him, by acts of benevolence and mercy. We can have no higher inducements to engage in this cause, than the love and example of Christ. Let us remember that love which the Saviour manifested, when He gave Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. "Being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no repu-

tation, and humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Such was His love! Look at his example. How anxiously He embraced every opportunity to do good, how fervently He prayed, and how diligently He labored to save those who were lost. Let us think of the love and example of Christ, and then say with the Apostle: "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that He died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose again."

We, of the Lutheran Church, have reached a crisis in our Foreign Mission, which makes it a question of solemn interest, whether it shall be sustained, or suffered to fail. From the last report of the Executive Committee it appears, that it is seriously embarrassed for the want of funds. The Society at its last meeting made an urgent appeal to the churches, for the necessary contributions, to enable them to go forward in sustaining and extending the work in which they are engaged. This appeal demands immediate attention. Our Foreign Mission, for which great sacrifices have been rendered, and which has been made a subject of prayer for many years, is just now in danger of becoming extinct. Its life is depending upon an immediate and vigorous effort to come to its relief. Without such an effort, it cannot survive much longer. It must fail; and with it must fall the pleasing hopes and prospects, with which its friends have looked forward to the time, when as a Church, we should take our full share with other Christian denominations, in the work of planting the standard of the Cross in heathen lands. There is a great responsibility resting on the Lutheran Church of our country, in regard to this work; and we must go forward in it, or incur the reproach of proving faithless to the trust which God has committed to our hands.

It is true, we have met with difficulties in the enterprise. The times have been unfavorable; the derangements in our currency, and the difficulty of procuring funds have caused serious embarrassments to the Executive officers, entrusted with the management of our Foreign Mission. But what good work has ever been achieved without difficulties. We are not to grow weary and faint-hearted, when we see difficulties in the way. If we would do our duty

as a Church, we must prosecute this work of Foreign Missions with unwavering faith in the promises of God, through all the delays, perils, and reverses, with which we have to contend. If we exercise such faith, and devote ourselves to the work with the zeal and energy, which its importance demands, the means will be furnished for its successful prosecution. The churches will be brought up to their duty, missionaries will be provided, success will attend their operations, and thousands of devoted Christians, who love our Foreign Missions and fervently pray for them, will rejoice in the conversion of multitudes of heathens that have been saved from perishing.

ARTICLE II.

LIFE AND LABORS OF OBERLIN.

The Lutheran Church has produced men distinguished in every department of labor, those who have been eminent as great thinkers and profound scholars, Christians of earnest faith and active effort, many who, in the results they achieved, and in the work they accomplished, have excited the admiration and wonder of the world, and exerted an influence which will be felt till the end of time. It is interesting and instructive to study the character of these men, to review their life and services, to trace the source of their power and usefulness, so that they may, after the grave has closed upon them, still speak words of encouragement and admonition; that their history may be, not only a memorial of fidelity and love, but an example to others, for distant people and later times, urging forward to increased zeal, and stimulating to renewed exertions in the great work of life.

Among these men eminent in a certain direction, remarkable for active benevolence and usefulness, public spirit and enlightened zeal, and for the singular power they exercised over the community with whose interests their labors were identified, one of the most striking is the Pastor of Waldbach, in the Ban de la Roche, who, buried in his remote and secluded parish, originated Chris-

tian enterprises and introduced moral reforms which, in modern times and more favored lands, were developed and perfected at a much later period. The character of Oberlin furnishes an admirable illustration of the application of religious principle to the ordinary duties and common pursuits of life, and its study will be found useful to the political economist, the philanthropist and the Christian teacher.

John Frederic Oberlin was born, August 31st, 1740, in Strasburg, formerly the capital of Alsace, near the Rhine. This city was originally founded by the Romans, but subsequently was subject to the Emperors of Germany. It became, at a subsequent period, a free town and was governed as a republic. In the seventeenth century, it was permanently united to France. Blessed with pious parents and reared under Christian influences, Frederic from his childhood exhibited evidences of consistent piety, and was noted for the benevolence and gentleness of his disposition, his constant desire to protect the weak, relieve the suffering, and to promote the comfort and happiness of the race. Illustrative of his character, at this early period in his history, several interesting incidents are presented. On a certain occasion he saw a poor, delicate woman at a shop, in vain endeavoring to procure some article, at a reduced price for want of money to pay for it; remaining until she had left, he placed the amount necessary into the merchant's hand, whispered to him to recall her, and then escaped from the shop, before she had time to express her gratitude. At another time, passing the market-place and observing some wicked boys rudely throw down a basket of eggs, which a woman from the country was carrying on her head, and the woman in great distress, he not only gave the boys a severe rebuke, but ran home for his little box containing his savings, and presented the entire contents to the victim of their cruelty. Once when he encountered on the street a public officer maltreating an invalid beggar, he fearlessly reprovved him for the act, and placed himself between the officer and the beggar. The officer was on the point of arresting the lad for interference with the discharge of his official duties, but some neighbors, with whom he was a great favorite, interposed, and prevented the result. Some days afterwards, as he happened to be walking in a narrow, lonely lane, he saw the same officer at a distance approaching him, and the

first query was, "Shall I run away?" "No!" he concluded, "God is with me! I rescued the poor man, and why should I fear?" He with fearless steps proceeded, and the officer without any altercation, and with a smile on his countenance, passed by. These characteristics, so prominent in his childhood, were strengthened by the judicious instructions and consistent example of his faithful parents. He often in after life acknowledged his indebtedness to a Christian mother, for his love of that which was pure and good, and for his earnest desires to be useful. Almost from his infancy he was the subject of religious impressions, of frequent convictions on account of sin, and of the deepest emotions. The constant prayer of his youth was: "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth!" "What wilt thou have me do?" "Show me thy will, O God!"

On the completion of his preparatory course, he entered the University for the purpose of prosecuting his studies, with a view to the Christian ministry. Whilst a student, he attended upon the religious instructions of one who was distinguished for the earnestness with which he preached "Christ and him crucified." A permanent change in the character of the young man was effected; impressions and influences at this time were made upon his mind, that were never effaced. He was thoroughly awakened to the claims of the Gospel, and brought to make a full surrender of himself to Christ. At the age of twenty, in a solemn covenant he consecrated himself to the service of God. This act of Self-Dedication, written and signed January 1st, 1760, and renewed ten years afterwards, gives us some idea of his earnest Christian principles at this early period, the key-note of his unfaltering devotion to Christ and his cause. At this distant day the paper may be read with interest and profit. "Eternal and infinitely holy God! with a feeling of deep humility and heartfelt contrition, I earnestly desire to come into thy presence. I well know how unworthy so sinful a worm is to appear before thy divine Majesty, before the King of kings and Lord of lords, more especially on such an occasion as this, even to enter into covenant relations with thee. But the scheme and plan, O Father of mercies, is thine own; thou hast, in infinite condescension, offered it to me by thy Son. Thy grace hath inclined my heart to accept it. I come, therefore, to thee acknowledging my

numerous transgressions, and with the penitent publican, strike my breast saying, 'God be merciful to me a sinner.' I come, because I have been invited by the name of thy Son, and I rely entirely upon his perfect righteousness. Be pleased, I entreat thee, for his sake, to pardon my ingratitude, and no more remember my sins. Be reconciled, I beseech thee, to thy disobedient creature, who is now convinced of thy right to him, and desires nothing so much as to belong to thee. Holy God! I this day, surrender myself to thee, in the most solemn manner. Hear, O heavens, and give ear O earth! I, this day, acknowledge the Lord is my God. I, this day, declare myself to be of the number of his children, and that I make one of his people. Hear my words, O my God, and write in thy book, that I, henceforth, devote myself entirely to thee. In the name of the Lord God of hosts I, this day, renounce all former lords that have had dominion over me; the joys of the world, in which I have too much delighted, and all carnal desires. I renounce all perishable things, in order that God may constitute my all. I consecrate to thee all that I am, and all that I have, the faculties of my mind, the members of my body, my fortune and my time. Grant me grace, O Father of mercies! to employ all to thy glory, and to live in obedience to thy commands, with an ardent desire to continue thine, throughout the endless ages of a happy eternity. Shouldst thou be pleased to make me, in this life, the instrument of leading others to thee, give me strength and courage openly to declare thy name. Enable me not only to devote myself to thy service, but to persuade my brethren, also, to devote themselves to it. Grant that, through the assistance of the Holy Spirit, I may be supported in life, and kept faithful unto death. Enable me, during the rest of my days, to acquire that, of which I stand most in need, and to amend my ways. May the things of time no longer exercise dominion over me, but may I, during the brief remainder of my life, live solely to thee. Grant me grace, not only to tread in the path, which I am convinced is the best, but enable me also to be always most active in walking in it. I resign myself, and all I am and have, to thy direction, to be disposed of, in whatever manner thine infinite goodness shall see best. I leave the management of all events to thee, and say without restriction, 'Thy will, not mine, be done!' Employ me, O Lord, as an instrument, consecrated to thy

service. Look at me as constituting one of thy flock. Wash me in the blood of thy beloved Son. Clothe me with his righteousness. Sanctify me by his spirit. Transform me more and more into his image. Impart to me through him all needful influences of thy purifying, cheering and comforting Spirit, and grant that my life may be passed under the habitual sense of thy presence, O Father and my God! And, after having endeavored to obey thee and to do thy will on earth, take me hence at the time, and in the manner, thou shalt see fit. When the solemn hour of death approaches, and I stand on the verge of eternity, may I remember this covenant, and employ my latest breath in thy service. And be pleased, O Lord, when thou seest the anguish, I may have to endure in my last moments, and when I, perhaps, may not have sufficient strength to recall it, to remember it too. Then look down with pity on thy feeble child, and enable him to struggle with death. I wish not to prescribe to thee, O my Father, in what manner thou oughtest to take me to thyself. I wish not to ask thee to preserve me from agonizing pain. No! nothing of the kind shall form the object of my prayer. What I earnestly entreat, in the name of Jesus, is, to be enabled to glorify thee in the last hours of my life, and to give evidence, in the midst of whatever sufferings thy all-wise providence may see fit I should bear, of patience and submission to thy holy will. Strengthen my soul. Give it confidence, when thou shalt call it hence, and receive it to the embraces of thine everlasting love. Admit it into the mansions of them that sleep in Jesus—into the mansions where indescribable joys will be its portion for ever. There permit it peacefully and joyfully to await the accomplishment of the promise thou hast made to all thy people—even that of a glorious resurrection, and of eternal happiness in thy heavenly presence. And when I shall have gone to the grave, if these pages shall fall into the hands of my surviving friends, may their hearts be sensibly affected. Grant them grace, not only to read them as the expression of my own sentiments, but also to feel for themselves what I have expressed. Teach them to fear thee, O Lord, my God, and to seek refuge with me under the shadow of thy wings, that they may partake in all the blessedness of thy covenant, through Jesus Christ, the great Mediator. To him and to thee, O Father and the Holy Spirit, be everlasting praises ascribed by the mil-

lions of redeemed spirits, and by all those other celestial beings, in whose work and blessedness thou shalt call them to share. My God, and the God of my fathers! Thou who keepest thy covenant, and who scatterest thy blessings, to a thousand generations, I humbly supplicate thee, since thou knowest, that the heart of man is deceitful, to vouchsafe to me grace to enter into this engagement with all sincerity of heart, and to remain faithful to my baptismal covenant. May the name of the Lord be an eternal testimony that I have signed this covenant engagement in the steadfast and earnest desire of keeping it!"

Oberlin, on the conclusion of his theological course, was ordained to the work of the ministry, but he did not immediately commence the pastoral work. He was, for several years, employed as a private instructor in the family of a physician, with whom he incidentally acquired a large amount of medical knowledge which proved of great value to him in his future labors. In 1766, he was appointed chaplain in the French army, which position he had concluded to accept, and was already preparing himself for its duties, when he received a most earnest appeal to labor in the interests of the parish of Waldbach, in the Ban de la Roche. This changed his plans. So fine a prospect of usefulness was here presented, that with his views of duty he could not disregard its claims, and he at once determined to occupy this field of labor. He had now just entered upon the 27th year of his age. But we must, for a moment, interrupt the thread of our narrative, and give some account of the place so long the scene of his active efforts, and the condition of the people, when he entered upon his work among them.

Waldbach was at the time, a desolate, scarcely civilized village in the bleak, wild and mountainous Ban de la Roche, which derived its name from a castle called *La Roche*, or the Rock, which the *Ban*, or District surrounds. It is also known by the German name of Steinthal, *the Valley of Stone*. The District had suffered severely in the Thirty-Years' War, and the population, that survived its ravages, was reduced to poverty and debased by ignorance. It was only in 1750, that any effort was made for the moral improvement and social elevation of this obscure and degraded people. A German Lutheran clergyman by the name of Stouber, moved by love to the Master, and his interest in suffering humanity, settled among

them, and with great zeal engaged in missionary work. Schools had been established in the community, but some idea of their character may be learned from the following incident, given by Mr. Stouber himself. On his arrival, expressing a desire to see the principal school of the village, he was conducted to a dilapidated building, in which he found a number of children crowded together, unemployed and in the greatest disorder. In reply to the inquiry for the teacher, so soon as order could be secured, one of them said, "There he is," pointing to a decrepit old man who lay in a cot, in the corner of the room. "Are you the school-master, my good friend?" inquired the stranger. "Yes, sir!" "And what do you teach the children?" "Nothing, sir!" "Nothing—how is that?" "Because," answered the old man with characteristic simplicity, "I know nothing myself." "Why, then, were you appointed school-master?" "Why, sir, I had been taking care of the Waldbach pigs, for a great number of years, and when I became too old and infirm for that business, they sent me hither, to take care of the children." The condition of the other schools was similar. The teachers were ignorant, many of them could not read with any fluency, and very few pretended to write. The art of instruction was not understood, and there was a great want of the elementary books required. Stouber, therefore, first tried to secure teachers, willing and qualified for the work. But as the office had fallen into disrepute, it was rather a difficult task. By the exercise of some little ingenuity however, the effort was successful. "Let us then, have no school-masters," said the Pastor, "as that would not become a people in your position, but permit me to select the most promising of our young men, and make them Superintendents, or Regents, of the schools." The change of name operated like a charm, all objections were silenced, and arrangements were at once made for the execution of Stouber's philanthropic designs. He next labored to secure the necessary books and the material for the erection of school-houses, but for a long time he had to encounter the ignorance and prejudices of the people. Opposition to the system of instruction was made by the peasants, from the fear, that some occult mysteries were concealed between the unconnected syllables of the spelling lessons. He gave them the Bible to read, of which they had no knowledge except by report. Aided by the simplicity

of his weekly services and of his private instructions, they soon learned to read with pleasure and understanding. He explained the Scriptures to them in his public discourses and at their houses, giving special attention to the great truths of the Gospel, the necessity of a change of heart and the exercise of faith in a crucified Redeemer. In this disinterested work Stouber was successfully engaged for several years; and when he concluded to transfer his labors to another field, he knew of no one, so well fitted to take charge of the mission in the Ban de la Roche, as the subject of our present narrative.

Although Stouber had effected many changes in the character of the people and introduced numerous reforms, the work was far from being completed. Oberlin commenced his labors by combining faithful diligence in the ordinary duties of the pastorate with wise and earnest endeavors to advance the education and general prosperity of the community. He projected more extended plans of improvement than his predecessor had attempted, and as the best means of preparing the way for his pastoral instructions, he determined to teach the people the ordinary arts and comforts of life. His efforts at first met with great opposition. The people had been accustomed to indulge so long in an indolent life, that they could not believe that their happiness would be increased by exertion. Some of the more malicious, too, united in a plot to lie in ambush for their good minister, and inflict upon him personal violence. Having been informed of their intentions; and the time they had selected, he preached, as usual, from the words: "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also;" and inculcated the lesson of Christian patience and submission under injury. At the conclusion of the services, the conspirators gathered together, wondering whether the preacher would act in accordance with his principles when they were brought to the test; but to their surprise, in the midst of their discussion, he made his appearance among them. "Here am I, my friends," said he. "I know all about your designs. If I have violated the rules, which I have laid down for your government, chastise me. It is better that I should deliver myself into your hands than that you should be guilty of the meanness of lying in wait for me." Deeply

touched by his simple address and ashamed of their conduct, they implored his forgiveness and mercy, and promised never again to oppose his kind and well-meant efforts. Only a few weeks afterwards, another scheme was concocted, in one of the other villages in the District, to seize him as he was returning from the services of the sanctuary, and beat him. Having heard of the plot, he preached on the safety of those who put their trust in the Lord, and of the sure protection promised them in all the trials and conflicts of life. He returned home after the exercises, by the usual way, although he knew that those, who had plotted against him, lay concealed in the bushes, and were awaiting his approach. He felt, however that the everlasting arms were underneath him. Undaunted he passed by them, and so completely were they discomfited, that not one ventured to touch him. These incidents had a salutary influence, and greatly aided him in his benevolent mission. Confidence in the man and his work was increased, and these very individuals who had been detected in their wicked designs, subsequently became his most devoted friends, and were most faithful in their co-operation.

One of Oberlin's first enterprises for the improvement of the people was the construction of a road, so that their territory might be accessible and communication effected with the more civilized districts of the country. The proposition at first was listened to with astonishment and incredulity. Its execution seemed to the ignorant and benighted peasants impossible, and they began to make excuses for not participating in the labor. But when they saw the worthy Paster take up a pick-ax, and vigorously engage in the work, they all soon joined him. He continued to direct and share their labors, until a road was opened with Strasburg, and a bridge thrown over the intervening river. When this was accomplished, he easily persuaded the people to make other roads, by means of which communication with all the five villages was established. The subjoined curious but characteristic letter, in which the repairing of a road is regarded as a religious duty, affords an apt illustration of his application of Christian principles to the common concerns of life. It begins thus: "*Road between Fouldai and Zolbach.* Dear friends of Foudai: Several persons at Zolbach have long been desirous that a certain road in your district, which runs to-

wards Zolbach, should be mended and put into repair. Such a measure would tend greatly to the advantage of Foudai. But for whose sake will you do it? Will you do it from love to your heavenly Father, to whom you pray every day and whom, in the Lord's prayer, you call Father, and who requires you to prove your faith by your works? Will you do it from love to the Lord Jesus Christ who has redeemed us in order to make to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works? Will you do it from love to God's children who are at Zolbach? You know that all the services which you render to the children of God and the followers of Jesus Christ, God regards as done to himself. Will you do it from love to the servants of mammon who are at Zolbach, that you may furnish them a good example, and by your kindness win their affections? Or will you do it from compassion to the animals, which your heavenly Father has created, and which he has himself honored by his covenant (Gen. 9 : 9.) with Noah after the deluge?

Oberlin also introduced among the people the mechanical arts by selecting from the older boys the best qualified, and apprenticing them to mechanics at Strasburg. He, likewise, improved their dwellings; neat cottages and comfortable homes were gradually substituted for the miserable cabins, which had generally been hewn out of the rocks, or sunk into the sides of the mountains. He made them, also acquainted with the improved methods of cultivating the soil and infused among them a taste for rearing fruit trees; so that in a few years a marvellous change was wrought in the appearance of this wild and sterile country. After instructing them in the various arts of agriculture, of which they were before totally ignorant, in 1778 he formed an *Agricultural Society*, which in addition to providing books and instruction on the subject, also instituted prizes for successful competition in this department of labor.

The principal efforts of the good Pastor were, however, directed to the moral and spiritual improvement of the community. His labors were all made subordinate and tributary to this one great object. On the Lord's day he carefully instructed them in the principles, doctrines and duties of the Christian religion, and neglected no opportunity of improving their character, reminding them of their natural depravity, of the necessity of repentance and the

consecration of all their powers to the Saviour. His labors on behalf of the rising generation, were most faithful and effective. His confidence in God was so strong, that he commenced the erection of a school-house in each of the villages, although without the means necessary to defray the expenses. He firmly relied on the Divine promises. Fervent in spirit and earnest in prayer, he felt that success was sure. His expectations were not disappointed. Assistance came from various directions, and the people cordially supported him in his measures. The buildings were erected, teachers were specially prepared for their work, and evidences of a marked change in the community were everywhere visible. The face of the country was completely renovated. Poverty and misery were supplanted by rural happiness and contentment.

But Oberlin, in his desire to perfect the system of instruction, so as to make it beneficial to all ages, having observed with concern the disadvantages from which the younger children suffered, whilst their elder brothers and sisters were at school, and their parents busily engaged in their daily avocations, presented a plan for the organization of *Infant Schools*, the first established, of which there is any record. For each village he appointed a female teacher. In the exercises, amusement and instruction were blended, very much on the same principle, on which these schools at the present day are conducted. Two women were employed in each school, one to direct the manual tasks, and the other, the lessons and amusements of the children whose ages were from two to seven years. When they became weary, the teacher would exhibit and explain to them pictures relating to scriptural subjects, natural history and geography. The children were, also, taught to sing hymns, and to avoid the use of the barbarous *patois* which was their vernacular tongue. Thus trained, in due time they entered the higher schools, in which a more elevated course of instruction was adopted. He also instituted *Sunday Schools*. The children of each hamlet assembled in rotation every Sunday in the church to sing the hymns, and to recite the religious lessons, which they had learned during the week, and to receive the counsels of their minister. Besides this meeting, all the scholars were once a week collected at Waldbach, and examined in their studies. His friends at Strasburg contributed liberally in aid of his schools, so that he was enabled to

procure books for a Library, and also philosophical apparatus and mathematical instruments. At a certain period the scholars were required, each one to plant at least two trees, for the purpose of impressing upon the youthful mind the duty of contributing something to the general prosperity. He also, organized in 1782, for the religious improvement of the people, a *Christian Society* similar to the *Young Men's Christian Associations* of the present day. The exercises consisted chiefly of prayer and religious conversation. Among the regulations of the Society, we find one requiring the members on the first day of every month, to pray for the success of missions, and another, proposing that, every Sunday and Wednesday at 5 o'clock, P. M., the members offer supplication on behalf of all connected with the Society, that they and their households may be saved; also, for all God's children of every denomination, that they may be united more and more in Christ, that the kingdom of Satan be destroyed, and the kingdom of God established among the heathen and nominal Christians; also for teachers and magistrates, for all pastors and laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, and for the young, that they may be preserved from the seductive influences of wicked example, and early led to a knowledge of the precious Redeemer. Another of the rules required that, every Saturday evening all the members pray for God's blessing on the preached word the following day. He also selected various mottoes and topics which he desired the members to consider and remember; among them were such as these: "Bring forth much fruit;" "Lose no time;" "Love not the world, neither the things of the world;" "Search the Scriptures diligently;" "We are all one in Christ Jesus;" "Provoke unto love and to good works;" "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love;" "Nourish the inner man by (a) the Word of God, (b) continual prayer, (c) the Sacrament of the Holy Supper." These sentiments with appropriate verses of Scripture, it was his practice also to have printed for distribution among his people and among visitors. Texts from the Bible were to be seen everywhere on the walls of his house. It was his constant aim to omit no occasion of doing good, or of impressing upon the heart and conscience important religious truths. He, also, established in his parish a *Bible Society*, auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Stated meetings were held, and col-

lections taken for the Parent Institution, the Scriptures were also read and prayer offered for the success of the cause. Female Bible Societies were, likewise, formed, the members of which loaned the sacred volume to their neighbors, and read it to those who could not read it for themselves.

Oberlin's success in reconciling differences and adjusting difficulties among the people was most remarkable. So much confidence was reposed in the integrity of his character and the judiciousness of his counsels, that all seemed disposed to trust his decisions, and follow his advice. He successfully terminated an angry controversy, which had existed for eighty years between the peasantry of Ban de la Roche and some proprietors of the territory in reference to the woodland which covered their mountains. The lawsuit, originating from this dispute, was a source of constant annoyance, a great drawback to their industry and a loss to the whole community. After years of acrimonious conflict, the contest was abandoned on terms regarded by both parties as advantageous. The magistrate of the province, who had so signally failed in settling the controversy, was so deeply impressed with the power of the good Pastor, that he begged him to suspend in his study the pen, with which the amicable agreement had been signed, as a memorial of the triumph which Christian virtue and principle had secured over bitter prejudices and long continued hostilities.

During the period of the French Revolution when almost every interest suffered, and religious worship of every kind was interdicted, this good man was unmolested in the discharge of his faithful duties. His house was the asylum of the persecuted and oppressed, of the many who had fled for refuge from the cruel scenes and bloody persecutions which were elsewhere enacting. All men had confidence in his integrity. His consistent piety, active benevolence and untiring energy, everywhere made a deep impression. About this time so deeply was his heart touched by the reports in reference to the wretched condition of the slave population in the West Indies, that he resolved no longer to use sugar or coffee, because they were the product of slave labor, and this resolution he faithfully kept during the remainder of his life, although its observance required the practice of great self-denial, inasmuch as from his infancy he had been accustomed to

these luxuries, But he was so much under the influence of Christian principle, that no matter how great the sacrifice, he was ever willing to make it, in obedience to his convictions of duty. The missionary spirit also was so strongly awakened in his breast, as the pathetic appeals reached him from distant lands, that his heart yearned towards those, who were perishing in their sins, ignorant of the glad tidings of redemption through Jesus Christ. When he heard of the spiritual destitution that existed among brethren of his faith in the United States, he was ready to respond to the earnest Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us." He had determined to immigrate to this country where, it seemed to him, there was so much work to be done for the German population, and his arrangements were nearly completed, when his designs, greatly to his sorrow, were frustrated by the American Revolution. His work evidently was not yet done in the Ban de la Roche, or Providence would have opened the way for his departure. Afterwards he could not, by any considerations, be persuaded to accept a position which required a removal to another place, and a separation from the people in whom he had become so deeply interested, and around whose hearts his affections so warmly clustered.

As the population of the Ban increased, Oberlin introduced among the peasants cotton-spinning and weaving, the art of dyeing, and various branches of manufacture. The flourishing settlement began to attract attention from abroad, and in 1818, in testimony of his services to mankind, and especially in the science of Agriculture, a gold medal was presented to the worthy pastor by the Royal Agricultural Society of Paris. Among other things in his Report, the Count of Neufchateau said: "If you would behold an instance of what may be effected in any country for the advancement of agriculture and the interests of humanity, quit for a moment the banks of the Seine, and ascend one of the steepest summits of the Vosges Mountains. For more than fifty years, to the advanced age of seventy-eight, John Frederic Oberlin has persevered in carrying forward the interesting reformation, first suggested and commenced by his virtue, piety and zeal. He has declined invitations to more important and lucrative situations, lest the Ban de la Roche should relapse into its former desolate state, and by his extraordinary and uninterrupted labors has averted from the inhabitants on sev-

eral occasions the horrors of approaching famine. Such a benefactor of mankind deserves the veneration and gratitude of all good men; and it affords me peculiar pleasure to present you with the opportunity of acknowledging, in the person of Mr. Oberlin, not a single act, but a whole life, devoted to agricultural improvements and to the diffusion of useful knowledge among the people of a wild and uncultivated district." The decoration of the Legion of Honor was also awarded him by Louis XVIII. as an appreciation of his services to humanity. He was visited too by distinguished travellers from different parts of Europe who expressed their utmost gratification with the order and happiness, which prevailed, and their astonishment at the great changes, that had been effected.

In his twenty-eighth year Oberlin was married to a most estimable woman of Strasburg, whom he had known for many years. She was cultivated and pious. She sympathised with him in his work, and by her discretion, fidelity and decision, rendered him most valuable aid. Her death, after a happy union of sixteen years, was to him a most painful bereavement. But not a word of complaint escapes his lips. He cordially acquiesces in the Divine will. "As in a thousand other instances, in the course of my life," he writes, "notwithstanding my overwhelming affliction, I am upheld, in a remarkable degree, by God's gracious assistance." One of his most cherished desires was an early re-union with the departed object of his affections. Frequently would he say: "I trust, that the world, in which God will re-unite me to my beloved wife, will soon open to me." Still he was patient and resigned. "Millions of times," he adds, "have I besought God to enable me to surrender myself with entire and filial submission to his will, either to live, or to die, and to bring me into such a condition of resignation, as neither to wish, nor to say, nor to do, nor to undertake anything, except that which He, who alone is wise and good, deems best." His life was, however, extended over a period of thirty-two years after his partner's death.

Oberlin's influence over the parish continued, until the last. As he advanced in years, and physical infirmities increased, his more active duties he resigned to his son-in-law, but there was no abatement of his interest in the work. With a face habitually serene, his life presented one of the finest specimens of happy old age. When he

could no longer labor, with unfaltering devotion he prayed for his beloved people; and that no one might be passed by, he was accustomed to keep a list of his parishioners and pray for them individually, and frequently he would write on his door the names of such as claimed special attention, lest they might be forgotten. He also spent a portion of his time in epistolary correspondence and in writing essays on religious subjects for the instruction of his people. Every sentiment he uttered, seemed animated by the spirit of the Master, an earnest desire to do good and to fulfill the object of life, by simple-hearted faith in God and patient submission to his will. His last illness was brief. On the morning of the second of June, 1826, in the 86th year of his age, and the 60th of his ministry, in Ban de la Roche, he gently passed to his rest, the place, "which sin can never touch, nor sorrow cloud."

As the intelligence of the good man's death spread through the District, it was received with unfeigned sorrow. The peasants in a vast concourse came from all directions through drenching rains and muddy roads, to look for the last time upon the countenance of their father and friend, to pay their tribute of gratitude and affection to the memory of him, who had been so closely identified with their interests, and who had steadfastly and enthusiastically dedicated his life to their moral elevation. When the procession with the corpse, on which were placed the Bible from which he had so long preached, and the robes which he had worn in the pulpit, preceded by the oldest inhabitant carrying a cross designed to be placed by the grave, reached the church, a distance of two miles, the mourners had not yet all left the house. At the funeral services in the church which, although closely packed, only a small portion could enter, a paper written by Oberlin, many years before in prospect of this event, was read. Among other things the following tender and impressive language occurs: "God will neither forget nor forsake thee, my dear parish! He has towards thee, as I have often said, thoughts of peace and mercy. All things will go well with thee. Only cleave thou to Him. Forget my name, and retain only that of Jesus Christ, whom I have proclaimed to thee. He is thy Pastor—I am but his servant. He is the Good Master who sent me to thee that I might be useful. He alone is wise, good and almighty—

I am but a poor, fallen, wretched man. Pray my friends, that you may all become the beloved sheep of his pasture. There is salvation in none other than Jesus Christ; Jesus loves you, seeks you, and is ready to receive you. Go to him, just as you are, with all your sins and infirmities. He alone can deliver you from them and heal you. He will sanctify and perfect you. Consecrate yourselves to Him. Whenever any of you die, may you die in Him, and may I meet you, with songs of triumph, in the mansions of the blessed, before the throne of the Lamb." The document concludes with a fervent and affectionate prayer, as follows: "O my God! let thine eye watch over my dear parishioners; let thine ear be opened to hear them, thine arm extended to succor and protect them. Lord Jesus! thou hast entrusted this parish to my care, fallen and miserable, as I am. Oh! suffer me to commend it to thee, to resign it into thy hands. Give it pastors after thine own heart. Never forsake it. Overrule all things for its good. Enlighten them, guide them, love them, bless them all, and grant that the young and old, the teachers and the taught, pastors and parishioners, may all, in due time, meet together in thy paradise! Even so, Father, Son and Holy Spirit! Even so, Amen!"

There is much that is attractive in the faithful labors of John Frederic Oberlin, and the lessons, derived from his useful life, may be profitable in their relation to our own personal efforts to do good. There have been men of more brilliant talents, of greater erudition and more varied attainments, but few individuals have been more earnest and devoted to their work, or more successful in the influence which they wielded, and the results they accomplished, than this humble Lutheran minister. He was the ideal of a good pastor, holy, harmless, separate from sinners, a man of warm heart and generous impulses, of great simplicity, of a frank, genial nature, uniform kindness and unsullied integrity. He possessed energy, industry, unconquerable perseverance, and a wonderful power of endurance. He was a man of methodical habits, a lover of order and subordination, sincere and unreserved in his intercourse, practical in his character and entirely consecrated to the service of the Master. His career was one scene of active benevolence and zealous piety, an exhibition of a loving heart, a blameless life and a tireless hand. He was thoroughly evangelical in his views, importunate

in prayer and strong in faith, and strikingly illustrated in his own walk and conversation the power and blessedness of the Gospel. He had a combination of good qualities which eminently fitted him for the field of labor assigned him by Providence. Notwithstanding the comparatively obscure and humble sphere which he occupied, he became the beloved patriarch of a renovated country and a regenerated people; his fame, as a philanthropist, has extended over the world, and his example has stimulated and guided others in their Christian efforts to advance the welfare and elevate the character of the race.

ARTICLE III.

EXPERIENCE AND PRACTICE AS NECESSARY IN RELIGION, AS IN SCIENCE.

By G. B. MILLER, D. D., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.

The condition of such as have not an experimental acquaintance with the truths and consolations of the Gospel, is one that deserves a great deal of commiseration, and excites the sympathy of every true friend of his species. The language of the Psalmist describes their state, when he says, "Surely every man walketh in a vain show; surely they are disquieted in vain." What labor is expended, what efforts are made, which if wisely directed, would ensure a vast amount of happiness, but which by taking an improper course, serve only to involve the busy and disquiet multitude, in an inextricable labyrinth of plans and schemes, of projects and hopes, that lead them still further astray from the only source of true bliss. Often they are rendered inaccessible to arguments and persuasion. They have no time for cool reflection. The want of something, they know not what, makes them restless; their restlessness urges them deeper into the vortex of business or pleasure. But nothing of this sort can appease the craving of the mind. They are stung with the consciousness of living beneath the dignity of a rational, an immortal being, but know not how to extricate themselves, or where to begin the change, which they feel to be needful, but

fear to be impossible. Many quiet the alarm of conscience, by an indefinite promise which they make, to choose some convenient opportunity to begin in earnest to seek the one thing needful. But, there are so many temptations to defer; their increasing heedlessness causes them to neglect so many favorable circumstances, that many, many alas! give themselves up to an indolent despair, and seek by various expedients to hush the reproaches of their conscience. Some by entirely absenting themselves from the instituted means of grace, cut themselves off from the assistance which a God of infinite mercy is ready to bestow upon them that seek him. Others who pay an external respect to the ordinances of religion, so far, at least, as to attend upon the services of the sanctuary, come with a mind so full of prejudices, and so unprepared for a calm and serious examination of divine truths, that they receive no benefit. What do all his powers of reasoning and persuasion avail to induce them to reflect upon their condition, and to seek in season a refuge for their souls? Unaccustomed to continuous thought, or else having all their thoughts and desires turned into the channel of worldliness, they stumble at the threshold of divine truth; they propose objections, they start difficulties which the wisdom of Solomon would be incompetent to remove; because, those who offer them, are not sufficiently advanced in their knowledge to comprehend the most satisfactory reasons that could be given. Not only do they expect to understand "the deep things of God," without the aid of the Holy Spirit, but things that are of themselves within the reach of the human mind, though demanding patient study and careful investigation, they want to seize at a grasp, and not succeeding in this, they throw the blame upon the preacher, or his doctrine. The truth is, that they begin at the wrong end. They want to master the difficulties of religion, without having learned the first elements of moral truth. To sit as pupils, to be treated as babes, they consider as an insult to their understanding. Yet, neither a Bacon nor a Newton would ever have attained to the heights of science, if he had refused to learn the alphabet. At the same time, it is a current remark, that a child can start difficulties in regard to natural science, which neither Newton nor Bacon could have solved, let alone, have brought down to a level with the child's comprehension. Even so, in religion, if we hope to make progress, intel-

lectually or practically, we must be content to sit at the feet of Jesus, the teacher sent from God. Our first steps in every sort of knowledge, human or divine, must consist in receiving on authority, if only it be a competent and accredited authority. And he that would proceed in another way, will find to his cost, that all his labor, if he takes ever so much pains, has been misapplied, and the utmost benefit he can derive from it—though that is a benefit not to be despised—is to have learnt that the way which he has been travelling, can never lead him to the truth. That he must begin anew if he would ever be profited; that he must consent to become as a little child, if he would enter into the kingdom of heaven; he must be content to become a fool if he would be wise. For such as have come to this acknowledgment and conviction, the door is open, the way is plain. “I will bring the blessed,” says Jehovah, “by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known; I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them.”

If these observations are just, the wisdom of God will be apparent, in the form, in which divine truth is proposed to us in his Holy Word. It addresses us as children, with authority and with kindness. “Come ye children hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil and do good; seek peace and pursue it.”

This wisdom was pre-eminently displayed in Christ. He taught with authority, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees. It is one of the distinguishing traits of the kingdom of heaven, as pointed out by our Lord himself, that the poor have the Gospel preached unto them; that divine truth is presented in a form which the most ignorant can profit by, provided they manifest a teachable disposition, while the wise and the learned, if they refuse instruction, will depart empty-handed. On a certain occasion, the Saviour rejoiced in spirit, and said, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father! for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

We trust no one has received the impression as though

the Gospel feared investigation, or that it inculcated the dogma, that ignorance is the mother of devotion. Just the reverse. The Bible challenges examination; it encourages, nay, it requires diligent research in those that would be profited by it. But it recommends to us, to begin at the right place, according to our capacity and advancement. A man may stand high in scientific and philosophical acquirements, who in all that relates to religion, is a mere babe. What the religious and moral condition of the Greeks and Romans was, in spite of their civilization, their refinement and their philosophy, we need not say. Some of the most eminent held sentiments and views that a child would be ashamed of. The multitude were immersed in superstition and vice, from which neither philosophy nor fine taste could deliver them. The Bible invites inquiry. To prove this, we may refer to the words of our Lord, when He says to the Jews: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Here is just that sort of examination enjoined, which lies at the foundation of Bacon's philosophy, applied to a subject of more importance than all the investigations of natural science; the principle of ascertaining the facts of a case, by actual experiment. And, is there anything demanded here, that is not consistent with common sense and the highest wisdom? "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself;" in other words, if we would be assured of the divine character of the Gospel, we must act according to its requirements.

1. The reasonableness of this demand. This demand to act upon the requirements of the Gospel, if we would be assured of its divine character, is perfectly reasonable. For, in the first place, it is the very way, in which all considerate persons act in ordinary affairs of interest and importance. In order to judge of the value of any rule or principle, we apply it to practice. Knowledge, merely theoretical, and separate from experience and actual application, does not stand in very high esteem with business men. It often leads a man into great absurdities of plans and conduct. It gives rise to vagaries of the imagination, and strange fancies. Now, why should not similar results take place in regard to religion? Experience fully sup-

ports the position. Plain, practical Christians, who carry out the principles of the Gospel, in the government and conduct of their lives, are seldom seen to fall into such extravagancies of doctrines and opinions, as may be witnessed in those, whose religion consists in mere unproductive notions. The common duties of life have a strong tendency to chastise the speculations of the brain, and to restrain a man within the bounds of what is practicable. But, could we collect all the fancies, that float in the minds of such as know something of the Gospel, without turning their knowledge to any practical use, it would form a sad specimen of the aberrations of human intellect. They would present a mass of impossibilities and contradictions. Such persons, and such, in some respects, are all the unconverted, indulge expectations in religious matters, which would stamp them with folly and cover them with ridicule, if applied to the ordinary affairs of life. What should we think of a man who would set himself up as a critic of Homer or Virgil, without knowing a word of Greek or Latin, except what he might have gathered in conversation, and who refused to go through the tedious routine of study, necessary to acquire those languages? And why shall it not be as reasonable a prerequisite, that we should do the will of God, in order to judge of the doctrine of our Lord, whether it be of God, or whether it be a human invention, the result of speculative reasoning, like so many systems of philosophy that have had their day, and have been superseded by others, resting on a foundation equally weak? Is the requirement that we must put in practice what we have learned, if we would gain a solid knowledge of religious truth, an unreasonable demand?

But there is a second ground on which we rest the reasonableness of this requirement. That is, that there is nothing in the doctrines of the Gospel, that is contrary to reason; nothing in its commands but approves itself to our own consciences as right and proper. There are, no doubt, certain things taught in the Bible, which unassisted reason could never have discovered. But that is included in the very idea of a divine revelation. And he who will admit nothing that he could not just as easily have discovered without a Teacher sent from God, must ever sit down in contented ignorance. There are duties enjoined, which are hard, or rather impossible for flesh and blood,

for our selfish, unrenewed nature. But, God has promised to give us a new heart: He offers to assist our weakness; He assures us that "He will work in us both to will and to do according to his pleasure." And he that proudly rejects this offered assistance, must see how he will save himself from the threatening ruin. But to him that is humble and teachable, willing and obedient, the way shall be made plain, and the discharge of his duty easy. This being promised, we may boldly say, that any one that will calmly and candidly consider it, must grant that the condition stated by our Lord, that we must do the will of God, in order to judge his doctrine aright, is just and reasonable. The bitterest enemies of the Gospel, have, for very shame, acknowledged that it contains the purest system of morals that the world has seen. The larger and more comprehensive the view a man can take of the moral condition and wants of the world, of what is necessary to ensure the greatest amount of individual, social and national happiness, the more will he be convinced, on a careful examination, that the Gospel presents the only adequate remedy for the evils of our present state: that its precepts and laws are based upon a plan that takes in the whole world, and all times and circumstances; and the whole man in all his relations; and the whole measure of his existence, not only for time, but for eternity. And, now, with all these facts before us, which one can but briefly hint at, with nothing demanded of us, but what our reason approves as right, and conscience enjoins as a duty, shall we not acknowledge that the requirement made by the Saviour, is reasonable?

A third ground of the reasonableness of this demand is, that it is most proper that God should require this of us; both for His own sake and for ours. It were derogatory to the dignity of Jehovah, to bestow spiritual blessings upon other terms. If we have not so much reverence for our Maker, as that we will follow His directions implicitly, without waiting to have all our doubts removed, it argues a state of mind utterly disqualified to share in his favor. Did not the Gospel demand an unqualified submission on our part, we should be deprived of one evidence of its divine origin. But now it comes to us with all that directness of command, which is the natural language of authority; which we are led almost instinctively to look for in a revelation of the will of God; especially when we

keep in mind, that we have been undutiful and rebellious children towards our heavenly Father, ought not the amazing fact that he tenders the first overtures to a reconciliation, to make us embrace the very earliest opportunity of showing a disposition to repent and to do better? Were we actuated by a proper feeling towards our gracious Master, should we not anxiously inquire, is there any possibility for us to be received into favor again? Would we not be disposed to examine into the claims of any message that purported to come from our injured Sovereign and Judge; and instead of being so incredulous as many are, and ready to raise the most frivolous objections to the Gospel of his grace, would we not at once determine to give it a fair trial? Are not all these difficulties that we pretend to find, mere pretexts with which to hide our unwillingness to return to our allegiance, and to yield to God the obedience which He claims from all His rational subjects? Do we not endeavor by such expedients to palliate our guilt and to quiet the reproaches of our own minds? Were God—to suppose an impossible case—to come down to our demands, would not the disposition from which they originate, lead us to go on starting new objections? How easy these are to be found, every one may have witnessed, in the ordinary intercourse of society, when a man is required to do something, to which he feels peculiarly averse. And is there anything to which the human mind is naturally more averse than to confess its faults, to repent of its sins and amend its ways? It is not only proper that God should require implicit submission to His authority, but we could not receive the Gospel on any other terms, because it would make us either despise the offer, or reject it as unauthentic.

2. The necessity of obeying the Saviour's injunction, if we would hope to be benefited by the Gospel. God will not retract His word; He will never accommodate His conduct to the perverse demands of His rebellious subjects, who deserve nothing but immediate destruction, as the just reward of their disobedience. This must be sufficiently evident from what has been presented. But there is a natural impossibility of our being benefited by the Gospel in any other way. There are other evidences of the truth of the Gospel, besides that of actual experience of its beneficial effects. There is the evidence from miracles,

from the fulfilment of prophecies, from the rapid propagation of the Gospel in the very times and countries, where it was first promulgated, where every opportunity existed for any one to satisfy himself of its truth, or falsehood. But these are all mere preparatory steps to the actual trial of its virtue. These may be necessary, in certain cases, to bring a man within the precincts of the temple; they may serve to prevent his stumbling on the very threshold of the sanctuary; but they bring him only where the chief part, if not all such as live under the sound of the Gospel, already stand. It is still necessary, after all these preliminaries are adjusted, to follow the very course which our Lord prescribes. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." And if one that had serious doubts of the authenticity of the Bible, could be persuaded to take this course, he would find it to be far the shortest and most satisfactory, nay, absolutely necessary to his participating in the blessings which the Gospel offers. So long as a man considers that to be poisonous, which the physician offers him, he will, of course, refuse to take it, and the first thing is to convince him of the erroneousness of his opinion. But, after all, he must yet take it, in order to experience its restorative effects. It is a case, therefore, that must be perfectly clear, that we must apply the Gospel to our personal use, in order to enjoy its life-giving power.

The Gospel, in its proper and profitable use, is of a practical nature. It must be applied to the regulation of our conduct, to the government of our temper, to the amendment of our heart, or it is of no avail that we hear its doctrines. As a man, to enjoy that vigorous state of the system, which is the result of suitable exercise, must take such exercise; or he that would receive nourishment from the food provided by a bountiful Creator, must receive that food; or he that would reap a crop of wheat, must sow wheat; so he that would know the Gospel to be the power of God unto salvation, must obey the Gospel; he must do the will of God. This implies that, what we know to be our duty, what the Gospel enjoins, and reason and conscience confirm, we must practice. He expects us to obey his commands in whatever way made known to us. And, if we seriously set ourselves to do his will, He will aid us. If we ask Him, He will give us His Holy Spirit. He is more ready to do this, than a

father is to give such good things as he knows, to his children.

Whatever our conscience tells us is wrong, is forbidden, is contrary to the will of God, we are to abstain from it, as we would from swallowing poison, or handling fire. We are to act only with the same discretion in things of a moral nature, as we do in natural things. But while we refuse to do the will of God, we will not escape with impunity. It is impossible. God would first have to change the whole course of his government; He would have to alter the nature of things, from what he has established. He would have to violate His solemn promises to the righteous, and threatenings to the wicked; He would have to change His own character; He would cease to be God, if any one should be made happy without doing His will. But what is more especially and immediately the will of God in regard to sinful creatures, is that we believe on His Son, Jesus Christ, whom He sent, to save us from our sins and their consequences. And is there anything hard or unreasonable, or impossible in this command?

What is it, but to believe that God is gracious and willing to re-admit us to the privileges of His children? What, but to confide in the truth, and the mercy, and the wisdom, and the power of God. To believe his solemn declaration, that He has no pleasure in the death of the sinner; that it is not at all His will that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And what is repentance? What, but to acknowledge that we were wrong in disobeying the wise demands of our gracious Maker and Sovereign; wrong in violating our own consciences, and yielding to the allurements of sin; wrong in living a reckless, thoughtless life, like natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed; wrong in acting more ungratefully even than the beasts; for the ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but we have not acknowledged our obligation unto God, nor considered His claims upon our gratitude and love. What is repentance, but when we discover that we have been wrong, that we have done foolishly and acted wickedly, have degraded our nature by sin, and provoked the displeasure of the Almighty, that we should confess the same honestly, and resolve with the help of God, to do so no more? What is faith, but to accept with humble gratitude, the gracious promises of our heavenly Father, that

if we return unto Him, He will receive us into favor again; to embrace his offered aid, and yield to the gentle influences of His Holy Spirit; to believe in Jesus Christ, whom He has sent to be the Saviour of a lost and ruined world, to rely upon His atonement as the ground of our reconciliation with God; to put ourselves under His guidance, as the Captain of our salvation, as the Prince of peace, the Lord of life, the procuring cause of all the blessings we already enjoy, or ever expect at the hand of God; to dedicate ourselves to Him, as His blood-bought property, with life and soul and influence, to live henceforth, not to ourselves, but to Him that died for us and rose again?

3. The happy effects of such obedience. "He shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." The term "to know" in Scripture, has generally a more emphatic meaning, than we are wont to attribute to it in ordinary discourse. To know God means something more than barely to know that there is a God, a knowledge which all but the fool possess; it means to have an intimate acquaintance with God, to know Him as our gracious God and merciful Father, to hold communion with Him by prayer, and meditation, and study of His holy word. Thus, when our Saviour says of such as do the will of God, they shall know of his doctrine, whether it be of God, it implies that they shall know it from personal experience of its healthful and comforting properties, its cheering, sanctifying, saving effects.

And first, by obeying the simple, reasonable and necessary requirements laid down by our Lord, a man will be relieved from the burden of guilt lying upon his conscience, prostrating his moral powers and checking every attempt at improving his spiritual condition. All men by nature are in the situation of bankrupts towards their Maker, such as the Saviour describes, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold and his wife and children and all that he had, and payment to be made." Such is the situation of every one of us by nature. And we know it, and in consequence, we feel disheartened and afraid. We know that the day of reckoning must come, and we are not prepared to meet the demands of justice.

Various are the expedients, to which men have recourse to drive out of their minds the sense of guilt, and the expectation of a coming judgment. But all in vain. Deep within the breast is heard the voice of conscience, low—muttering, or sometimes loud—thundering in their ears, “Sinner, prepare to meet thy God.” Not only are we conscious of a vast debt of responsibility and guilt already incurred, but we are sensible, also, that we are perpetually adding to the fearful amount, by living in disobedience to the commands of God. We know, that he demands our obedience, our reverence and submission, while we are living in a state of opposition to His holy will. There is a controversy between God and the sinner, and some day, and some how must it be settled. And, if the wish should arise in our hearts to serve and obey our Maker, the difficulty presents itself to the reflecting mind, what can be done with the old score, that stands against me. No one who was indebted to his neighbor, would think it a valid excuse for not paying, to assure him that he would run in debt no further. Nor would the laws of any well regulated country pronounce a criminal clear, for merely promising, that he would offend no more. Thus we all stand towards God, indebted in ten thousand talents, with nothing to pay. No one, that takes time to reflect on his condition, can rest easy and satisfied under these circumstances. For there is no escaping the hands of Divine justice, as a man may escape from the action of human laws. Here a God of infinite goodness steps in to our relief. Of His own free and sovereign will, of His good pleasure, without any inducement held forth on our part, unasked and unsought, He has provided a way of reconciling the difficulty; a way consistent with his holiness, truth and justice; a way which displays His mercy in the brightest colors, which makes it practicable to save the sinner without relaxing the authority of the divine law, or fixing a stain upon the moral government of the world. Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, voluntarily assumes our nature, with its whole debt of guilt; He pays it from the infinite treasure of His merit; He offers a free pardon to all that will return to their allegiance. He assures us, that if we entrust our cause to Him, He will bring us off safe in the court of heaven; if we obey Him as the Father’s ambassador, sent to reconcile us unto God, He will restore us to the forfeited rights of citizenship, to

all the privileges of the children of God. But this is altogether a moral transaction. It is not a question of dollars and cents; nor a point of legal policy. The service which God demands, which alone can be of any value in His eyes, is the service of the heart, the homage of our affections; and to do the will of God, includes in the very idea, that we love, reverence, trust and obey Him.

And in order to make these feelings possible for us, God has given us in Christ Jesus, the fullest proof of His gracious disposition towards us, of the yearnings of His paternal heart over every repenting prodigal, so affectingly portrayed by the Saviour, in the parable of the younger son who left his father's house and spent his estate in riotous living. "But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." And when the poor, penitent began to stammer out his confession, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son," he interrupts him with saying to the servants, "Bring forth the best robe and put it on him." What system of religion, but that of the Bible, has ever represented the Almighty in such a light, as a father rejoicing over his lost son, that is found again? Who among the philosophers, ancient or modern, has ever hit upon such an idea? He that does not see, in this beautiful delineation of the love of our heavenly Father, a message brought directly from heaven by Him who was from eternity in the bosom of the Father, whom He sent forth to seek and to save His lost children of the human family, must be awfully deficient in the feeling for what is divine. But all this love is manifested, that we may be induced to return, to submit again to our Father's will. Therefore, he solemnly assures us, that He is no longer angry. He is reconciled through His Son, and has sent forth his servants to beseech men to be reconciled. If then we feel our hearts drawn towards God, on the review of what He has done for us, we should be persuaded to follow up this feeling. It is the gentle drawing of His Spirit, by which He would woo us back to our Father's house. And if we do His will, we shall know for ourselves, of the doctrine which Christ taught, whether He brought it from heaven, or whether it is the idle dream of human speculation. So soon as, in serious earnestness, we resolve to do the will of God, because it is our duty as a rational and accountable

being, because we feel it our privilege thus to manifest our gratitude as a redeemed sinner, we will, at once, begin to realize that the doctrine taught by Christ, is indeed from heaven, that He, and He alone, has the words of eternal life, that a divine power unto salvation accompanies the Gospel, wherever it is received in faith and simplicity. The first effect, will be, that the crushing sense of guilt will be relieved ; we will begin to feel some confidence in God ; we will love Him, because He first loved us ; we will feel a strong attachment to that divine Redeemer, to whose mediation we owe our restoration to peace and happiness. But nothing short of a sincere, thorough, and universal disposition to do all the will of God, as far as known to us, will avail. This only constitutes a true conversion. A hypocritical confession, or a wavering obedience will be fruitless. Nor need we expect the blessing on these terms. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all," says an apostle, by which he means, that if we should make but a single reservation, in which we will not obey the command of God, this is virtually rejecting His authority, and proclaiming ourselves rebels against His government. Our obedience is, and will necessarily be imperfect, and we are not to be saved by our obedience on legal principles ; but it must be sincere and uniform, which is often called evangelical obedience, of which St. John says in his 1st Epistle, "Whosoever abideth in Him (*i. e.* in Christ) sinneth not," he does not sin habitually and willfully ; it is his earnest desire and disposition to do the will of God, and nothing grieves him more than the discovery of so many imperfections, that still cleave to his best attempts ; while as the apostle goes on, "Whosoever sinneth," viz. : with deliberation and purpose, "hath not seen Him, neither known Him." His religion is all a pretence. Besides the removal of the burden of guilt, a second benefit that we shall derive from doing the will of God, is that we shall love God and delight to hold communion with Him. A friendly intercourse of parental love and filial reverence will be established. We feel that we have been admitted, by adoption, into that holy and happy family, of which the Father in heaven is the Supreme Head, and Christ is the elder brother. "Truly," says St. John, "our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." "If our hearts condemn us not," if we are conscious of the sincerity of our faith

and obedience, in short, if our faith manifests itself by our works of love, of temperance and devotion, "then have we confidence towards God, and whatsoever we ask we receive of Him, because we keep His commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in His sight." There is a new and tender relation produced by faith in Christ. We have become the children of God, first-fruits of His creatures, whom of His own will He begat with the word of truth.

With such feelings, how pleasantly can we pass the time of our sojourning here below. We can rejoice in God as a faithful Creator, to whom we have committed our souls in well-doing. Duty becomes easy, when actuated by love. As a family united by the bonds of a strong affection, amidst the endearments of mutual kindness, and rejoicing in each others company, can easily forego the vain amusements of the world, seeing that they have pleasures of a purer cast flowing from their mutual friendship and domestic employments, which they would not exchange for all the riotous enjoyments of the sons of mirth; so the Christian in communion with God, in his union with Christ, and fellowship with his brethren of the faith, in his labors and exertions for the welfare of man, and the spread of the truth, has, in the expressive language of the Lord, meat to eat, of which others do not know. Calm and peaceful is his life; cheerful and regulated his mind. His heart is filled with love to God and man. He is happy and desires to see others happy. The struggle of fierce and contending passions has been hushed. And should trials and afflictions beset his path, he is not greatly moved by them. He has that temper which is prepared to meet trouble, and to break its shock. He has a Friend in heaven, to whom he can communicate all his griefs, and who is able to give him advice and comfort. He has the example of Christ set before him, for his encouragement and support. And he has the assurance, that to them that love God, all things must work together for good. Should he have to part with every earthly comfort, he does not lose his all; his chief treasure is safe, for it is laid up in heaven. Just as a man who has the bulk of his property insured, will not lament greatly over the loss of a few articles which the fire has consumed. Thus the happy effect of doing the will of God, manifests itself here already. The Christian is a happy man, the only happy man. Even the unconverted can often perceive that he has sources of joy

and comfort to which they are strangers. True, his life may be chequered with sorrows—for we have no absolute promise of a comfortable life on earth; the remains of sin and imperfection in the best, compel God to chasten His children; while the wickedness and misery that reign in the world, cause much grief to every benevolent heart, so that with the prophet, he may often say, "Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water, for the destruction of the daughter of my people;" or with righteous Lot, who dwelling among the wicked, "in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day, with their unlawful deeds." He may be persecuted and reviled, driven from place to place, and treated as the offscouring of all things. At all times, and under the most favorable circumstances, while in the body he groans, he has a cross to bear, the flesh and its works to mortify.

But in his greatest grief, there is joy, with which no stranger intermedles. His Lord is with him in the fiery furnace, and he is safe. He can rejoice in tribulation, for it makes the sincerity of its faith and the value of his hope more manifest. He knows that the doctrine which he has received, is from God. His own experience has taught him this. He has found the promises of God to be sufficient. He waits with patience and perseverance for the time of his release from labor. He looks forward to share, through infinite grace, in that "rest, that remaineth for the people of God." There, in the upper sanctuary, he knows that all tears shall be wiped from every eye; there sin and imperfection, and sorrow have no place. There all is joy, and peace, and rapture, and songs of victory, and ascriptions of glory to Him that loved us, and redeemed us with his own blood, and saved us from our sins, and made us kings and priests unto God, even the Father. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."

ARTICLE IV.

MELCHISEDEC.

By Rev. J. B. GROSS, Easton, Pa.

Of the ancient and illustrious personage, whom St. Paul describes, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, under the magnificent title of "King of Salem, and priest of the Most High God," we have, unfortunately, not the least trace of a genealogy, and, of course, no knowledge of his earlier career. Hence, in the third verse of the seventh chapter, of this Epistle, the apostle of the Gentiles declares him to be, "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God: abideth a priest continually." These words may be thus explained: no record or tradition, in regard to Melchisedec's parentage being extant, the apostle expresses the fact, by saying that he had none, which simply amounts to this, that no one knew his pedigree. We get a glimpse of him but once, and he disappears, probably forever from our sight, and from our researches. Christ, our high-priest, is compared to the Salemite priest, Melchisedec, and declared to be made after the similitude of him, who abideth a priest continually. This adverbial expression continually, we must not press too closely, but consider it as implying only a very long time; for even the high-priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ shall terminate at the final and universal subjugation of the moral world, to the dominion of the Supreme Being. (1 Cor. 15: 24-28.) Melchisedec was a cotemporary of the patriarch Abraham, and exercised the two-fold and eminent functions of king and priest, in the city of Salem, at the time that the Hebrew shepherd, renowned subsequently, as "the father of the faithful," no less bravely than generously rescued his unfortunate nephew Lot (Gen. 14: 14-20,) from his captivity, (as mortifying as it must have been undeserved) among the four confederated kings, "Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch, king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer,

king of Elam, and Tidal, king of nations." On his return to "the Plain of Mamre," his nomadic home, his road led him in the vicinity of Salem, known, at a later period, as Jerusalem, composed of Jebus and Salem, but corrupted into *Jeru*-salem, instead of *Jebus* or *Jebu*-salem. Melchisedec, rightly presuming that his neighbor, and, most likely, a member of his church, a man of note, being at the head of a numerous and powerful family, and holding the office of sheik or emir, a position which implies the exercise of subpriestly functions, must very much stand in need of refreshment, after his noble but laborious military exploit, hastened to meet the victor, and offer to him the opportune gifts of "bread and wine." Such conduct displays a great and generous soul, and proves that Melchisedec possessed as benignant a heart, as he did exalted rank. In his high sacerdotal capacity, "as priest of the Most High God," he, moreover, pronounced this solemn benediction upon the Hebrew chief: "Blessed be Abraham of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth;" and grateful towards God for this successful enterprise, he continued: "And blessed be the Most High God, who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hands." Abraham, as a member of his sacerdo-regal community, thus, at the same time, acknowledges his fealty and his thankfulness to him: "And he gave him tithes of all," the spoil.

Some authors have expressed the opinion, that, instead of Salem, the future Jerusalem, Melchisedec resided at a place, on the banks of the Jordan, also called Salem, in our English version. But the Greek of the name of this town or village, is not Salem, but Saleim or Salim, and it is, therefore, an entirely distinct locality, little fitted to be the seat of regal power, and priestly supremacy. Salem and Zion, (Ps. 76: 2,) are expressive of the same place, Jerusalem, the ancient stronghold and abode of the Jebusites.

A personage figures in the one hundred and tenth Psalm, who, in the first verse, is called, "my Lord," and of whom, it is affirmed, in the fourth verse, by an oath from the Lord, that he should be "a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." According to St. Paul, (Heb. 5: 6,) this, thus honorably distinguished individual, clothed with high sacerdotal functions, not only pre-figures, but proleptically represents and actually is, Jesus Christ. Sustained by facts like these, the apostle declares that Melchisedec had

been priest of the most high God, long before the institution of the Levitical ritual; that, therefore, those liturgical rites had been but temporarily obligatory upon the Jews; and that, inasmuch as Jesus Christ had been made a priest, after the priesthood of this illustrious prototype of the Son of God, the ritualistic laws of the Jews, were now to be considered, as forever abolished, and the Gentiles entitled to be received into the Church, without objection to their obsolete requirements. This fact is farther elucidated and exhibited in its true strength, by a reference to the striking difference, which exists between the Levitical priesthood, and that of our Lord. Paul, in the seventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews, distinguishes between the Levitical and the Christian dispensation, in a train of argument, substantially like the following: "Abraham paid tithe to Melchisedec, and is, therefore, to be regarded as occupying an inferior rank to that of Melchisedec. He is blessed, and says Paul, "Without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better. Now, inasmuch as Abraham paid tithe, his descendants, the Levites, who were yet in his loins, or seminally contained in their ancestor, Abraham, when he thus did homage to the "King of Righteousness," virtually paid tithe in his person. Besides, if the Levitical or Aaronitic priesthood had been perfect, there would not have been need of the institution of another. But there has been need of another, and, of course, a better, the priesthood of Jesus Christ. This priesthood has no direct or organic connection with that of the Levites, and can, therefore, not represent or perpetuate it. Neither as regards the line of his descent, nor the character of his sacerdotal office, has Christ anything in common with the Aaronitic priesthood. He is of another tribe, the tribe of Judah, and he is a priest of a new order, "the order of Melchisedec." Hence, according to the eighteenth verse of the same chapter, the Levitical rites or laws are annulled, both on account of their weakness and their unprofitableness. Again, the Levitical priesthood was instituted "without an oath," but that of Christ (Ps. 110: 4,) "with an oath;" those priests were mortal and had always to be succeeded by others, but Christ "lives forever." Finally, when Abraham paid homage to the king of Salem, and priest of the most high God, he was still uncircumcised, and, therefore, not a member of the Jewish church, which did not then exist, but a member of the Melchisedecan

church, and a true worshipper of God, without the pale of the Jewish church.

The residence of Melchisedec was Jerusalem, which, in the age of the distinguished Jewish chieftain, Joshua, and, at a still later period, went by the name of Jebus, thus named from the tribe of Canaanites, called Jebusites, the ancient inhabitants of the place. From the first book of Chronicles, (11: 4-5) it appears likely, that David, the puissant king of the Jews, first conferred the name Jerusalem upon this mountain-home of the Jebusites, which, according to history, they loved enough, heroically to defend it against the Jewish invaders. In this old Jebus or Salem, afterwards Jerusalem, and still later, Mount Zion, "The city of our God, the mountain of his holiness," was, it seems, a church of the most high God, whose members, Abraham and perhaps the most of his family excepted, were of heathen origin, composed mainly or exclusively of the Jebusites, a tribe of the Canaanites, and whose king and priest was Melchisedec. Doubtless, some persons will be amazed at the idea, that a true, godly church, consisting of heathen, grown, believing and pious, anterior to Moses or to Christ, and living amid heathen, whose corrupt lives, according to the Jewish annals, disgraced the name of humanity, should have constituted a holy church of God. The apostle Peter, with a mind happily disabused on this subject, and now full of liberal and philanthropic sentiments, exclaims: "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him!" "Can there any good thing come out of Nazerath?" asked Nathanael, and Philip in reply said, "Come and see." From a despised city of the decried Galileans came a Saviour, and from the heathen too, now and then, a good thing may come. Pythagoras, who led a pure and virtuous life, enjoined the duty of self-examination upon his disciples, as their earliest and latest daily work. Frugality of living, temperance and sobriety of deportment, were inculcated as virtues of the highest importance. The respect due to the aged, he failed not to exact. Virtue, said the wise man, is the perfection of the soul. He held, that rewards and punishments should be adapted to the different degrees of guilt or merit. He sought God, who, according to St. Paul, "is not far from any one of us," and he found him. The doctrine of a future existence formed

a main article of his creed. It was based upon the belief of the transmigration of the soul after death, through other sentient organic bodies, suited to its wants or deserts, and of such a rank or nature, as always to further its continual advancement in its different probationary stages of progressive development. Socrates, too, showed that "God had not left himself without a witness among the heathen." He likewise had a school, consisting of numerous followers, among whom was the divine Plato. Only the wise and good, in the opinion of the Athenian philosopher, can be happy. Like Pythagoras, he taught the existence of a Supreme Being, the God of gods; and so firmly did he believe in the immortality of the soul, that death seemed but a transition into life. According to the lessons of the Socratic school, he is the most perfect man, whose propensities and desires are under the control of reason. In a dialogue, recorded in the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, a disciple of the sage, and a most excellent man, between Socrates and Enthydemus, on the subject of the Supreme Deity, the former expresses himself to the effect, That the good God, who has made all things, may be recognized in his manifold and wonderful works, which he ever governs and preserves, in their unimpaired vigor. Let us, he continues, ever strive to render just homage of respect and veneration to the Divinity, whose will it seems chiefly to be, that we should realize and adore his varied and boundless goodness towards us. This is good doctrine, considering that it is the result of unaided reason. Alas! many who walk amid the light of Christian revelation, have less reason, and a worse faith than this. These, among many other examples, may suffice to show that truth and righteousness may even be the heritage of heathen, and that the Jebusites may have had a true and holy church in Salem, administered by Melchisedec, priest of the most high God.

When king David conquered Jebus or Jerusalem, he treated the inhabitants with unusual lenity, an instance of rare magnanimity, in the military career of this heroic, but sometimes, cruel monarch. From this treatment of the vanquished people, it is, with good reason, to be presumed, that Jebus contained a sanctuary, as well as a priest, of the Most High God, and that both Abraham and the Jebusites, probably other Canaanites too, were members of good standing, of this Melchisedecan church. The ob-

jection to this theory, urged with renewed vehemence, is, that it is not at all likely, that while even the descendants of Ham were generally involved in the folly and guilt of idolatry, there should have been a true Church, not only among the Canaanites, but composed almost exclusively of Canaanites, the posterity of Ham, and the unhappy objects of a hereditary and inveterate Jewish hatred. The Jewish pretensions to extraordinary holiness, as the posterity of Abraham, whose high spiritual excellence, each claimed as an individual merit, deserves no endorsement, or favorable regard, as it is simply based upon self-conceit, and a sad want of charity for other nations. Michaelis, on this interesting and novel subject, as set forth in his "Typical Theology," in substance says: Against the probability of the existence of a Church of God, in Salem, in the midst of the Canaanites, is urged the fact, that Abraham expressly forbade, that his son should form matrimonial relations among the Canaanites. And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had: "Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son, of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell. But thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac." (Gen. 24: 2-4.) But it should be borne in mind, that this prohibition was made more than half a century later than the first mention of Melchisedec, during which lapse of time, the morals of the Canaanites, may have become much corrupted. Besides, the assumption is simply, that a Church of God flourished among the Jebusites, in Salem, without predicating the existence of a similar organization, among the other kindred tribes. All that is sought to be proved here, is, that there was a good seed still remaining among these Hamitic people, and that this good son prospered and bore good fruit, under the tutelar care of the king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God. In addition to this, it may be observed, that it is quite uncertain, whether indeed, it was on account of idolatrous religious practices among the Canaanites, that the aged patriarch forbade a connubial relation of his son and heir with one of their daughters; nay, it is even exceedingly probable, that it was not owing to religious considerations, at all, that the prohibition was made, as there prevailed among his own

kindred, of whom he sought a bride for his son, the practice of idolatry, once, and in its purer form, the common creed of mankind. (Gen 31: 19-30 & 31-35) Partiality for his family, and an idea that the nomadic mode of life, was more honorable than agricultural pursuits, furnished sufficient motives for such conduct. These objections being thus without force, or in other words, untenable, it is morally certain, that Melchisedec, king of the Jebusites, in Salem, and priest of the Most High God, had among his subjects, a greater or less number of persons, who were members of his church, unless we prefer to believe what is not plausible, that he was priest solely in his individual capacity, without a church, or, at most, only for some unknown and remote people, of whose existence it would be vain to indulge a conjecture. Probability and reason, therefore, favor the existence of a Jebusite church, in Salem, the Jerusalem above, the regal home and scene of sacerdotal activity of the great Melchisedec.

A new difficulty appears to claim our attention here. Could Abraham, if Melchisedec was a Jebusite priest, own him for his priest? Why not? Was not Melchisedec a priest of the Most High God? Besides, is not the presentation of the tenth of the spoil, evidence of homage to a superior? And does not St. Paul reason well and irresistibly, when he asserts that, "Without all contradiction, the less is blessed by the better" Perhaps, however, it may be suggested, that the patriarch gave tithe to the kind and considerate priest, from motives only of politeness. The idea, however, is improbable, for such an act has ever been construed, by mankind, as denoting the indisputable fact, that he who bestows the tenth of his substance upon a priest, does it because he expects to receive the benefit of his priestly functions, or, in other words, through his instrumentality to communicate with Divinity, and obtain Divine blessings. But why Abraham, who at that time, did not stand in the special covenant relations to Jehovah, of which mention is made, in the fifteenth and seventeenth chapters of Genesis, could not maintain a churchly connection with Melchisedec, a priest. If the Jebusite church is not "the Jerusalem above," or that which existed in the days of Melchisedec, the free church, the symbol of the Christian Church, and "the mother of us all," (Gal. 4: 26) what is it, and where is it to be found? It is demonstrably certain, that, at the time, to which the priesthood of

Melchisedec is referred, there did not exist a law commanding, either the Levitical institution generally, or the rite of circumcision specially, and that, therefore, the apostle argues, the proselytes to Christianity can be under no obligation to observe, either circumcision or the Levitical law, inasmuch as (Isaiah 66: 20-22; Gal. 4; and Heb. 7,) the Christians belong to the church of the old Jerusalem, and are the antitypes of the Jebusite church, at the head of which stood the good and holy priest, Melchisedec.

The church of Melchisedec, generalized and consummated in Christ, is the Church to which the heathen, according to St. Paul, is to be converted; for, if our great and glorious high priest, Jesus Christ, is the true, foreordained antitype of Melchisedec, then our Christian Church must, likewise, be the antitype of the ancient Jebusite church, in Salem, the Jerusalem above, the primitive and free Jerusalem, as it was in the age of the sacerdo-regal Melchisedec, and not of the Jewish church, which was first instituted and provided with ritual laws, and typical rites, in the Arabian desert,* centuries afterwards, and subsequently transplanted into Palestine, the fair "Land of Promise." In other words, we, as Christians, have virtually passed over into the Church of Salem, as it existed, or was administered, in the age of Melchisedec. We are, therefore, really children of the patriarch Abraham, who "built altars to the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord;" who had the promise given to him, that his seed should be numerous "as the dust of the earth," and who was honored with the words of hope and comfort, "Fear not, Abraham, I am thy shield, and exceeding great reward," before he stood in circumcissial relation, either to God or to the Jewish church. Hence too, the laws which Moses gave to the Israelites, long after the institution of the circumcissial rite, do not (thus teaches the Apostle,) bind the people of non-Jewish nations or origin; and, in as far as Christ is the end of the law, the Jews, even, are no longer subject to the Old Testament ritualism. It is, therefore, abundantly evident, such too, is the conclusion, at which the Gentile apostle arrives, that the Gentile proselytes to Christianity, are not under obligation to observe the Mosaic institutions, in their secular and Levitical import, but only the require-

*The Passover forms an exception.

ments of the Church of Jesus Christ, the antitype of the Jerusalem above, the free, ancient Jerusalem, as it existed and flourished, in the days of Melchisedec, king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God.

ARTICLE V.

THE CONFLICT IN THE CHURCH.*

By REV. S. A. HOLMAN, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.

Much has been already said and written, concerning an existing conflict in our Lutheran Zion. In proposing to refer to it, on this occasion, as a topic of discourse, I am not unmindful of an apprehension, which probably exists, that there can only be a reiteration of familiar truth. Whilst repeated convictions may be regarded as appropriate and necessary, so long as controversy exists; it is suggested, as a further apology for the present discussion, that the controversy itself is desirable, so long as it is conducted in the spirit of charity, and for the ends of truth. The Alumni of the Theological Seminary, are more than merely interested spectators of this scene of Conflict. They are destined in the Providence of God, to determine to a very great extent, the ultimate result, and realizing its importance, they will welcome argument, on either side, as the only proper means, by which the truth can be discovered and maintained.

A few reflections upon the controversy, which has a present, and a personal, interest, are, therefore offered to your consideration.

A prominent characteristic of the Christian Church—from apostolic times to the present—has been the *Doctrinal Controversies* of her own adherents. History, indeed, records other prominent features of her experience. Her *outward* Conflicts, are illustrated; in the persecution of Jewish and Pagan foes, in her infancy; in the rising tide of Mohammedanism, in the seventh century, which sup-

*An Address, delivered before the Alumni of the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, Gettysburg, Pa., August 11, 1868.

planted Christianity in many of its strongholds; and in the assaults of infidelity, in the eighteenth century, which declared the Bible a deceptive source of knowledge, and reason and nature alone reliable. A conspicuous position, is likewise assigned to the aggressive development of Christianity, in planting its fundamental doctrines among the nations of the earth. It is, indeed, the greatest fact of History, that the grain of mustard seed has grown into the tree, which already overshadows the world; yet the irrepressible truth appears at every stage of progress, that Christianity established by its Divine Head, and universally acknowledging the revelation of His word, as its rule of faith, has an uninterrupted record of Doctrinal Controversy, Heresy and Schism.

It is unquestionable, that these *internal* Conflicts, have injuriously affected the progress and piety of the Church. Whilst they have illustrated the unfathomed depth of Divine Truth, they have revealed the foolishness of reason, and the infirmities of Christians. But as good and evil are inevitably intermingled in this transitory world, it is proper that we should consider the *compensations* of this evil experience of Doctrinal Controversy. One or two illustrations, must suffice.

No difficulty harrassed the apostle Paul, in his missionary work, more than the dogma of the Jewish Christians, that the Gentiles who professed Christianity, should be required to observe the ceremonial law, as a necessary condition of salvation. Yet, that bitter Conflict, in the very infancy of the Church, was the occasion which secured to Christianity, one of its richest legacies. The question that was raised by the exclusive party in the early Church, was neither ignored nor evaded; it was discussed and decided, and that decision, has received, forever, the confirmation of the Inspired Word. Who would consent to lose from the epistles of Paul, such precious truth as this? "For the kingdom of God, is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, for he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men." This summary of the judgment of the apostle, concerning conscientious differences of opinion and practice, which then existed, and which he discusses at length, in more than one of his epistles, was called forth, by the persistent efforts, of a portion of the Church to impose the Mosaic restrictions upon every

Christian believer. Far be it from me to justify indifference to aspects of Divine Truth, which are not essential to salvation; on the contrary, it is held that every statement of the Divine Word—"all Scripture being profitable for instruction in righteousness"—deserves and invites the judgment of the Church, as to its true intent and meaning; but it is a blessed truth, and for the revelation of which, we are especially indebted to the Pharasaic righteousness of apostolic times, that in the kingdom of God, the believer can exercise the right of private judgment, and of individual conscience, upon the dogmas of his fellow Christians.

Another illustration of the Divine method, which compensates the Church, for the peril of conflicting opinion, appears in that memorable crisis of Christianity, which gave birth to our own Evangelical Lutheran Zion. What a spectacle did the Church present, at the beginning of the sixteenth century! The nations of Christendom were taught that they need not look to a living God, for the free gift of eternal life; the sufficiency of a suffering Saviour was regarded as the fiction of a dream: there was no thought of that *faith*, by which we are made partakers of righteousness, and of a heavenly heritage; men were taught to obtain Divine mercy, by having recourse to the superstitions of their own imagination, in works, in penance, and in a round of senseless ceremony. Perversion of the truth, of necessity, lowered the standard of morality. The doctrine, that indulgence to sin could be purchased, became the source of extortion and crime: the ministers of the Word—unable to read it—became the leaders in debauchery; even the Pontiff became the vice-gerent of Satan, to corrupt the visible Church. The student of history will readily observe, that this very depth of degradation, was the *occasion*, of the sympathy and co-operation, so signally manifested, when that great re-action came, which found its leader and noblest representative, in Martin Luther. What agency, could have caused the true and the good of that time, to greet the doctrines of the great Reformer, with an unparalleled enthusiasm, as the contrast of the utter helplessness, and the deplorable consequences which the dogmas of the Papacy produced? The evils then existing in the Church, engendered the Conflict, and the Conflict was essential, to the clearest and fullest exhibition of the truth. The darkness of its former condition,

has enabled the Church to discover the brightness and the glory of its reformation.

This simple truth, that God has always employed the Conflict of opinion in the Church, as the means of advancing His people in knowledge and power, we should frequently remember now, as our apprehensions are awakened for the peace and prosperity of our Zion. The existing Conflict, is but one of the *agencies* of an overruling Providence, through which some aspect of truth will be more clearly revealed, to qualify the generations who come after us, for new and greater Conflicts. As we have so largely profited from the struggles of our fathers, so is it revealed to be our destiny and our duty, to wage the warfare of an *opinion*, for the welfare of those who shall hereafter bear the standard of our faith. It is God's universal law, as true in grace as it is in nature, that the storm is appointed, to purify and preserve.

Having thus taken a hopeful outlook, let us consider the Conflict itself.

The idea, which concentrates it, is expressed by the term *Symbolism*. Disavowing any implication, that there is odium in the use of that word, I employ it respectfully, as an appropriate and expressive term, to designate the true meaning of the Conflict. There is indeed a collateral issue of much significance, designated by the term *Ritualism*, and, whilst there is no necessary connection, between the symbolic idea of doctrine, and the ritualistic idea of worship, it is nevertheless a matter of fact, that both ideas have the same advocates, and the same antagonists. The present discussion is limited to the one question, the first, and the more important. One of the characteristics of Symbolism, is its definite and extended statement of doctrine: it may with greater propriety, than any other exhibit of opinion in the Church, be called "the definite platform." Yet, the investigation of the Divine Word, for the *purpose* of presenting a definite statement of the true meaning of every declaration of inspired truth, must be approved of all; and it is by no means improbable, that the visible Church will yet realize the hope of Symbolism, in this respect, that all the doctrines of the Divine Word, may be "set forth in the same words, and that those words, can be used in one and the same sense." For, as it is the *aim* of Theology, to give to man a correct understanding of all Divinely revealed truth, so has that science been

making constant progress, in the attainment of its object. It was not until almost the present generation, that the Church was permitted to understand the true exegesis of the first verse in the Bible. Well nigh six thousand years had elapsed, and that verse was read with a sense, far different from that in which it is now universally understood. In the infancy of the Christian Church, the controversy concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, which began in the middle of the Third century, did not culminate, until more than one hundred years had passed away. At length, the Athanasian Confession affirmed the identity of essence and co-equal existence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as the true statement, of the meaning of the Divine Word, concerning the doctrine of the Trinity: and that opinion, has been confirmed by the judgment of every succeeding age. To say that there can never be an agreement of opinion concerning the topics of doctrine, which are now the subject of dispute, is to deny to Theology, that which is granted to every other science. The human mind constantly employed in the investigation of the mysteries of nature, ever and anon returns with some discovery of truth, to astonish and to bless mankind: different schools, maintaining opposite opinions, often indeed arise, in the same science and in the same art, but they only exist as agencies, to solve and settle, sooner or later, the questions at issue. Now the Divinely inspired word, has been revealed, manifestly for the instruction of the visible Church, and "*all* Scripture being profitable for instruction in righteousness," a correct understanding of their true meaning is, at least, within the probabilities of its future knowledge. The destiny of the Church, as revealed in the Apocalypse, is confessedly a mystery, in many of the particular features of its experience; yet, as the visions of the Prophet are realized, and pass into history, the meaning of that which is dark and incomprehensible to us, will be clear and intelligible to those who have the facts of history or experience as their guide. I know it is said, and said truly, that it is impossible for all men to think alike, on the questions at issue. But that opinion, does by no means, establish an unchangeable law in relation to human judgment, and it cannot effect the true meaning, of the Divine Word, which must ever be, *one*, and the *same*. To infer, that because men now differ, therefore, they can never agree, is to infer, that henceforth, there is to be no pro-

gress in learning ; it is to ignore the manifest progress of the past ; it is to assume, that what God has seen fit, to declare, to be the revelation of His will for man, is not for man. Hence, we should not ignore the discussion of those topics of doctrine, which now divide the Church. It should be our desire, in this controversy, to understand the truth, to know who is right, and the only way, by which it is possible to decide the question, is to discuss it. Whilst the relative insignificance of the topics of doctrine at issue must be acknowledged, their intrinsic importance appears in the fact, that they form the *Shibboleth* of a divided church ; and either as a correct, or as an incorrect exhibition of the true meaning, of the declaration of the Divine word, they demand the earnest study of all who realize the significance of truth.

Again—the question in the *present* controversy, is not whether Symbolism, *per se*, is right or wrong. The doctrinal basis of the opponents of Symbolism, does not declare that the symbolical books are an incorrect exhibition of the doctrines of the Divine Word, nor is it just to say, that it implies their error. An *official* declaration, that these symbols are wrong, would be as liable to objection, as is the official declaration that they are right. I say *official* declaration ; a declaration made by the organized representatives of the Church, as an expression of the faith of the Church. For, whilst the right of private judgment may not be surrendered to the dogmas of any creed, and whilst the individual *conviction* must ever be, the only true subscription to any doctrine, so, likewise, a creed can only be truly called the creed of a church, when it represents the private judgment, or the individual convictions of the great mass of its membership, in matters of doctrine. Now, the *point* at issue, in the present controversy, is simply this : the opponents of Symbolism maintain, that there is not now, and never has been, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of this country, such a uniform and decided conviction of the truth of these symbols, as to justify their incorporation into a doctrinal basis.

Whilst this declaration of a diversity of opinion, respecting these symbols, may be applied to the Lutheran Church of other lands, and in other times than our own, yet it is maintained to be right, to confine the truth of the declaration, to the Lutheran Church, as it exists in *this* country, and from that restricted stand-point, to argue the

validity of opposition to Symbolism. For the mission of the Church, in every age, and in every land, as the mission of the individual, is peculiarly its own. It was not the mission of the Church in the third and fourth centuries to discuss Symbolism, but by the Providence of God, the Arian Controversy was made the instrumentality, by which the Church should, then and forever, be brought to the true understanding of the relation which the Persons in the Godhead sustained to each other. It was not the mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, at its birth, to discuss Symbolism, but that Church was brought into being, that it might rescue and defend those fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, which were well nigh obliterated from the knowledge and belief of man. Symbolism, was an after thought, cherished and developed in the Lutheran Church.

When the Church in *this* country grew in numbers, so as to make an organic union of its membership desirable and necessary, the question of Symbolism, after the lapse of nearly two hundred and fifty years, was still unsettled. Yet had the Church then, as it has now, its providential mission, viz.: to gather and preserve its scattered but increasing fold, in this new and growing country. The great work of the Lutheran Church, and its true mission, ever since it has had existence here, has been an *external* rather than an *internal* development; it has been the preservation and extension of its visible organization, rather than the perfecting of its faith, on the non-essential topics of doctrine. The lapse of nearly fifty years has not changed, it has only made more manifest, the true providential call to the Church in this land. It was no sacrifice of principle, therefore, when our fathers held the claims of Symbolism subordinate to the claims of self-preservation, and of external development. Had Symbolism secured the harmonious and uniform concurrence of the Church; had there been a generally accepted vindication of its claims, it would have been made, and justly made the standard of faith. But those who established a visible bond of union for us in this land, did not fail to realize that there yet existed such a reluctance to accept the claims of Symbolism, that any assertion of its principles, in a doctrinal basis, would be both inexpedient and unscriptural. The bond of union for the Church, and the agency for its external development, were at length established in the formation

of our General Synod. In the declaration of its principles, Symbolism was regarded as an open question, to be neither officially vindicated nor denied. Essentially the same position is maintained at the present time. The Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod is a tribunal, to which the advocate of a rigid confessional system, and the advocate of a recension of the Augustana may with equal right appeal. That Basis does not disclaim the discussion of the disputed topics of doctrine in the Church; it recognizes the duty of every believer "to prove *all* things, and to hold fast to that which is good." It is prepared to adopt every item in the schedule of Symbolism, when they are vindicated not so much by ecclesiastical authority, as by unanswerable logic, and the *sure* testimony of God's Word. So, on the other hand, can it consistently accept a recension of the Augsburg Confession, when Symbolism is overthrown by the concurrent judgment of the Church.

An objection of a practical character will perhaps naturally suggest itself, to a basis so liberal and apparently non-committal. The advocates of Symbolism having sundered their former ecclesiastical connection, and effected an organization to establish and extend their views, it may be urged that the advocates of another definite statement of doctrine, who are convinced that the disputed topics are manifest error, will eventually arise and undertake a similar experiment of separation, and thus leave the compromising Basis of the General Synod without adherents from either of the discordant elements it has endeavored to conciliate. If such a contingency occurs, it must evidently arise from circumstances, similar to those, which led to the separation of the advocates of Symbolism from the General Synod, viz.: the failure to alter its Basis, and control its administration. But a majority, who have already prevented a change in their Doctrinal Basis, and would *again* be able to prevent a change—in the contemplated contingency—would doubly illustrate and prove the wisdom and true policy of the present basis, by the best of all logic, the judgment of the majority. On the other hand, a prevalent conviction of the error of the statements of Symbolism, and of the necessity of a recension of its errors from the doctrines of the Church, would likewise vindicate the present basis, which will not declare

that to be true, which subsequent conviction must declare to be false. The form which the present controversy will ultimately assume, may, of course, confound the dogmatism of any prediction. Some, convinced, that the only possible bond of union for the discordant elements in the Church is the Augsburg Confession, as a correct exhibition of fundamental truth, assume as an evident corollary, that it alone will yet become the rallying cry of a united Church: and the pleasing hope is cherished, that when we complacently ignore the discussion of the questions which have rent the Church in twain, the era of union, of harmony, and of prosperity, must, of necessity, dawn upon us. But anticipations of success, often fail to be realized. It is possible, indeed, it seems to me, to be one of the events of the future, as has been already indicated, that by the progress of knowledge, the truth or error of Symbolism will be so apparent to the unbiased judgment of the Church, that it cannot hesitate to give an unequivocal declaration *for* or *against* it. Nevertheless, the future is not ours. The Church can only act, in view of what *exists*. The creed of an *existing* Church can only express what *is* the faith of the Church, not what the Church of the past has declared, nor what the Church of the future will believe. The Church, like the individual, has a *present living* existence, in reference to which its responsibility especially relates. It is on this principle, that the Lutheran Church of this country, as represented in its General Synod, has acted from the beginning, and it is to this principle that it yet adheres. Its doctrinal basis seeks to know, and to represent that which is really the faith of the Church, the faith of its living membership.

Symbolism, on the other hand, sets forth its principles of faith, which are to be understood in but one sense, and in that sense, to be uniformly subscribed. As the grounds of conviction for the Church, it presents what it considers binding ecclesiastical authority, the judgment of theologians in the Church, three hundred years ago. In the process of reason it offers argument, which to a portion of the Church, is incomprehensible, and by another portion the validity of the argument is denied.

The *necessity* for the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, has been more and more clearly revealed in the progress of its history. What answer can be made to the fact, that it now, and has been from the beginning, the

true expression of the faith of so large a portion of the Lutheran Church. On that basis, chiefly rests the glory and success of Lutheranism in this land: on that basis, the Church has established Theological Seminaries; and from many institutions of learning, of various grades, in sympathy with it, have flown streams of influence, that have blessed humanity: on that basis the Church has grown with a ratio of increase, that will compare at least encouragingly with the growth of the nation; and of the other denominations of Protestantism. On that basis it has been able, especially to secure the sympathy and co-operation of the Anglicised Lutheran element—the element which is destined to control the Church of the future in this land: on the basis of the General Synod, have lived and labored some of the noblest servants in the Church; their memory is precious, as their labors were useful, and their lives illustrious. It is an argument of much force, that of the venerated dead, who have been distinguished for their piety and learning, so many have given in its behalf their living testimony and their matured judgment. The following declaration, made before the recent rupture in the Church, by one well known to us all, and who not long since, entered into his rest, will justly represent the opinion of the sainted dead:

“The basis of the General Synod may be regarded as *alone* adapted to hold together the elements somewhat discordant of our Lutheran Zion. This abandoned, division will ensue, one will be separated into many, and the record will be not one of many, but many out of one. Such has long been my conviction, and it is strengthened, not weakened by our recent history, and a survey of the entire field of Lutheranism in this country. There is no other safe ground.”* If the testimony of the fathers is to control our judgment, let us heed such words of wisdom. If the success of an idea, is to be regarded as evidence of its necessity or value, let us regard with favor that which has proved to us a blessing.

The same causes, which led the Church in this country to exclude Symbolism from its confessional standard, exist in the Fatherland, and have existed there from the very inception of the Conflict. What is the meaning of that persistency with which Symbolism clings to the qualifica-

*Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sr., in *Evangelical Review*, July 1858.

tion of an *unaltered* Augsburg Confession, as the true symbol of Lutheran orthodoxy? It means that an *altered* Confession appeared from the pen of the immortal author of the original Confession, only ten years after it was first proclaimed, and reveals the fact that the matured judgment of the great Melancthon, was not prepared to assert that Symbolism was of binding authority upon the Church.

What occasioned the *necessity* for these additional statements of Doctrine, which constitute in their united form, the Symbolism of the Church? Manifestly the existence of an opposing faith, the extent of which is described by the advocates of Symbolism, "as not only leading *many* of the people astray, but as embittering the minds of theologians against each other."* They acknowledge that "a general assembly of the Church was not convoked to consider the Formula of Concord"†—that it was not adopted by the assembled representatives of the Church‡—and apologise for the small number of signatures it received § It is well known, that in many of the Sovereignities of Continental Europe, where Lutheranism prevails, Symbolism has never been officially endorsed.

The same opposition to Symbolism, as of binding authority upon the Church, which was manifested in Germany three hundred years ago, is witnessed there to-day. This is illustrated in an observation by the distinguished American editor of the popular commentaries of Dr. Lange, and his co-laborers. In commenting on the doctrine, set forth in the famous tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, he says that "Dr. Kahnis, who is quoted by Lange, as the chief modern champion of the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist, in his recent work on didactic theology, gives up the literal interpretation of the *verbi*, to which Luther always resorted as the strongest bulwark for his theory of the real corporeal presence of Christ in the sacramental elements"|| The declaration of a clergyman upon the floor of the General Synod, at its last convention, that in a personal interview with Dr. Tholuck of Germany, that distinguished theologian had declared himself in sympathy with a doctrinal basis which would not bind the Church to Symbolism, will go far to confirm the judgment of those who believe that such a basis is the best.

*Introduc. Bk. of Concord, p. 75. †Introduc. Bk. of Concord, p. 83.

‡Introduc. Bk. of Concord, p. 84. §Introduc. Bk. of Concord, p. 85.

||Lange Com. Matt. 26 : 26.

It is evident from the character of witnesses like these to which I have referred, that the questions which originated the doctrinal controversies in the Lutheran Church, are still unsettled—that there is no uniform concurrence of opinion among the leading theologians of our Church, in the old world, or in the new, as to their correct decision. Yet, these discordant facts, and this state of indecision—which even the learning and the labor of the Church for three centuries, have not been sufficient to remove—can neither obscure nor stay the duty of the individual, or of the Church as the organic representative of individual faith.

No one on either side of this controversy, who can realize the import of the Divine Word, to “*prove all things, and to hold fast to that which is good,*” can justly advocate or denounce Symbolism as a system of truth, until he has made the disputed symbols the subject of his faithful and impartial study: and in whatever conviction, his investigation may result, there is it his individual duty to abide: from which no hopes of policy may lead him, and no fears of ecclesiastical authority may drive him. Moreover, within the sphere of Christian liberty, and according to the rule of Christian charity, there can be no just objection to his right to convince others, and to convert all, whom it is possible, to his standard; and, is there not reason for the champions on either side to remember, that the pride of opinion, which would enforce conviction by its dogmatism, and affected contempt for the ignorance or the prejudice of opponents, are the least effective weapons of warfare? The advocates in this controversy, who suppose that personal invective, or the spirit of arrogance, or the obtrusion of grievances, will add to the power of argument, or supply the want of it, will justly meet with disappointed hopes.

But what of the Church? What will be the fate of its creeds and its basis of doctrine, if such unrestricted license is allowed? Must not the creed of a Church, form the faith of the individuals? No! the creed of a Church has always been, and will be nothing more nor less than the individual convictions of its membership. And these convictions must be formed, not by the creed, but by the word of God. The “*Principles of Faith*” or “*Basis of Doctrine,*” proclaimed by the present generation in the Church, may, and will, be overturned by the next, if it will

so adjudge; and the grounds of its justification, and of its ability for such an act, will be the inwrought conviction of the individuals, that a necessity for so doing existed, on account of their understanding of the true meaning of the Divine Word. If these premises are true and right, then the *duty* of the Church, as an organic representative of the faith of its membership, is clearly manifest. It is simply to be the *organ* and not the *master* of its membership; it is to declare, not what the individual membership *must* believe, but what they *do* believe. It can express nothing more; it should declare nothing less.

A concluding word upon the relative value of Symbolism. I have not disparaged its claims, and repeat the conviction, that its statements of doctrine, sanctioned as they are by no mean names in history, and relating, as they do to declarations of God's Word, deserve no supercilious contempt. But amid the varied questions and conflicts which appear to have been accumulating in the past, only to be thrust upon the Church of the present age, for a decision, Symbolism seems to be destined yet to bide its time, and take a subordinate place in the interest of the Church. It has, indeed, waited long, and it is not strange that it has become restless under the repeated delay of a final decision, which will forever approve or deny its pretensions. Its reviving strength, yet its actual defeat upon the only field on which it can hope to struggle with success, is the evidence, that it is *not yet essential to victory*, in the mightier Conflicts of the Church.

Like a rivulet flowing by the side of the mighty current of clear and fundamental truth, which rolls onward, with its overwhelming flood against the bulwarks of error, it will eventually find its way into the stream, if it can contribute purity and power: but if it can only stagnate, it must sooner or later be turned aside, and lost forever amid the barren heresies of the Church.

A few weeks ago, there assembled in the historic city of Worms, one hundred thousand representatives of Protestant Europe. The object of that vast concourse, was nothing less than to do homage to the memory of the great Reformer, whose honored name as a Church we bear. The emblem of their extraordinary tribute was a monument, which, in its size; in its rich variety of design; and in its artistic execution, stands without a rival. Grouped around the gigantic statue of Luther, were the figures of Wick-

liffe, Waldo, Savonarola, and Huss. On the graven tablets, were some of the immortal words of Luther, conspicuous among which were these: "Those that rightly understand Christ, will not be moved by what man may enjoin. They are free, not in the flesh, but in the spirit." And these: "It is only through the *Spirit of Christ*, that we can hope to understand Holy Writ." And there too, were the kings and princes of several sovereignties, to dignify the great occasion with their august presence. England's Queen, the head of "the established Church" and the "defender of its faith," sends her message of sympathy and congratulation; whilst the Roman Catholic Mayor of Worms consents to declare the illustrious service which Luther gave to modern civilization.

Now, there is significance in the circumstances thus described. In that grand and costly commemoration of the ideas and labors of Luther, Symbolism had few, if any illustrations. Those mute statues, and those graven words, spoke to the vast multitude which thronged around them, only fundamental truths; the doctrines which alone make Luther the hero, and which made Lutheranism the hope of the modern world.

If it is our shame, that we do not follow the footsteps of Luther, in the dogmas of Symbolism, let it suffice to be our glory, that we are the followers of Luther, in that which makes him the great Reformer; and for which alone, there was almost an apotheosis at Worms.

ARTICLE VI.

CODEx SINAITICUS.

Although the readers of the *Quarterly* may generally be familiar with the discovery and character of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, yet a few facts connected with the history of this valuable manuscript, older perhaps, than the oldest previously known, and certainly more complete than any

other written in the *uncial** letter, may not be uninteresting to those, whose attention has not been specially directed to the subject.

Codex, in its original sense, was a term used by the ancients in connection with their books, made of the wood of trees next to the bark. The word was thence transferred by the Romans to signify a piece of writing on any material whatever, with the *stylus* on tablets covered with a coating of wax, and bound together, in the shape of a book, or on a roll of parchment, or paper. The term was subsequently applied to manuscript volumes. In the times of the Emperors, it was used to express a collection of laws and constitutions. *Sinaiticus* is derived from Sinai, the mount lying between the Gulf of Suez and Akabah, on which, according to the Pentateuch, God announced to Moses the ten commandments and the other laws, by which the Israelites were to be governed. At the eastern base of Jebel-Musa, in the ravine of Shouaib, stands the famous monastery of St. Catharine, with whose name this *Codex* is so closely associated.

It was in the library of the monastery of St. Catherine, that this ancient manuscript, embracing a considerable portion of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and the whole of the New Testament, was discovered in 1859, by Professor Tischendorf, of the University of Leipsic. The great importance and critical value of this discovery to the whole Church none can question. Written as early as the fourth century, and probably not much later than two centuries after the death of the last Apostle, it will always be regarded as high authority in the study of the sacred text. Some account of the man, who made the discovery, and of the incidents and circumstances, under which the treasure, hidden, for so many centuries, from the public eye, was secured, may be useful for reference.

Dr. Constantine Tischendorf's whole life may be said to have been consecrated to this particular department of Biblical literature, to the critical examination and elucidation of the sacred text. He has been, for many years,

*The manuscript copies of the Sacred Scriptures have been divided into two classes the *uncial* and the *cursive*, the former written in capital letters, the latter in running hand. The earlier manuscripts were written in *uncials*; the cursive were not used, till the close of the ninth, or the beginning of the tenth, century.

generally acknowledged as the industrious explorer and learned editor of manuscripts, and his success furnishes only another illustration of the fact, that earnest, faithful, and resolute devotion to any object, or pursuit, will not be unrewarded. Perhaps, there is no one more generally known for his critical labors in connection with the revision of the Greek New Testament, or more highly appreciated for his valuable discoveries, collations and publications of manuscripts than the indefatigable Leipsic Professor. He has devoted years of active and incessant labor to the study of the Greek text. He has published numerous editions of the New Testament, and, by his extensive travels and successful researches, has rendered many difficult and obscure passages of Scripture, simple and clear. He has, also, made important additions to the Apocryphal literature of the early Church, and placed it within the reach of Biblical students. The Apocrypha, accompanied with valuable notes, prolegomena, various readings and translations, he has carefully edited. He has, likewise, performed a great service by his contributions to the Apocryphal Gospels, which, by their character and history, confirm the Divine authority of the canonical books, and strengthen the faith of the believer. In addition to his own original researches, so accurate and reliable, the account of his unwearied efforts and toilsome journeys is most interesting and instructive. After exploring the libraries of Paris, England, Holland, Switzerland and Italy, with the one idea constantly before his mind, he, several times, visited the East in the prosecution of his great work, the search of documents, the disinterring from the monasteries and the tombs, in which they had so long been buried, parchments of the Holy Scriptures and other manuscripts of ancient lore. Arabia and Egypt, the Libyan Desert, Mt. Sinai and Jerusalem, Asia Minor and the island of Patmos were the scenes of his laborious investigations. He ransacked every place in Europe, the North East of Africa, the Levant and Asia, where a manuscript of the New Testament, or even a fragment, was likely to be found. And so devoted was he to the object, and so enthusiastic in its pursuit, that on one occasion he commenced his journey without any funds, and with no baggage but his overcoat. But whithersoever he went, he found kind and faithful friends, and among those, who fur-

nished him aid, were some of the most prominent individuals of the day, distinguished promoters of literature and science, men of all nations and creeds, Protestants, Catholics and Mohammedans, whose sympathies and co-operation he so successfully enlisted in his enterprise. His efforts in the East were greatly advanced by letters from the leading statesmen and rulers of Europe. No one in his researches, perhaps, ever enjoyed such facilities, and no one ever made a more careful and diligent improvement of the advantages afforded him. It is difficult to read the simple narrative of his sacrifices and toils, his disappointment and success, his depressions and his exaltations, possessing all the interest of a romance, without sharing something of his own feelings, and uniting with him in expressions of gratitude to a kind Providence that exercised so watchful a care over him, and crowned his efforts with ultimate success.

It was in 1846, during a visit to the East, under the auspices of his royal patron, Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony, that Dr. Tischendorf found in the monastery of St. Catherine a miscellaneous collection of old fragmentary manuscripts, "musty with age and half consumed by time," laid aside in a large chest, as if worthless, "incapable of connection, restoration or use," waifs rescued from the fire. Other fragments of the same manuscript were subsequently discovered, but the manifest anxiety of the literary explorer to possess the musty documents, awakened in the minds of the monks the suspicion, that they possessed some value, and made them only the more desirous to retain the treasure. His efforts to possess it proved futile. His expectations were disappointed, his plans all frustrated. He did not, however, despair. Having failed in his attempt to secure the manuscripts, as the next best thing he exacted from the monks the promise that they would preserve them with sacred care, entertaining the sanguine hope that, at some future day, the parchments would come, either into his possession, or that of some other Biblical student.

In 1853, this earnest and enterprising scholar revisited the monastery with the full determination to transcribe the *Codex*, should he succeed in finding any remains of it, within the walls of St. Catherine. The monks on his arrival gave him a respectful, and even cordial reception, but how great his disappointment and distress to find that

he could gain no intelligence concerning the much desired and long sought for document. It was to him a severe trial. But he was not discouraged. He could not be persuaded to abandon the enterprise. He resolved to persevere in the cherished object of his unwearied pursuit.

By the generous influence and kind assistance of the Emperor, Alexander of Russia, Dr. Tischendorf was enabled, in the year 1858, to undertake another journey to the East. He was commissioned by him to revisit the scenes of his former explorations for the purpose of examining and purchasing ancient Greek and Oriental manuscripts, such as would promote the cause of Biblical and ecclesiastical learning. On the 31st of January, 1859, he reached the monastery of St. Catherine where, just fifteen years before, he had found the fragments of a very ancient *Codex* of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. For several days he mingled freely with the monks, but he could gather so little information in reply to his earnest inquiries, and failure in regard to the object of his pursuit seemed so inevitable, that by the 4th of February he had completed his arrangements for a speedy departure to Egypt on his course homeward. His horses and camels were engaged for the journey, and his fond desires were about to be hopelessly abandoned. But before starting, during a casual walk with the steward of the monastery, he happened to speak of his labors and investigations, and to refer with regret to his want of success in securing the manuscripts, which were the sole object of his present visit. The conversation had awakened the interest of the monk, and on their return from the walk he invited the Professor to his room, when he laid upon the table a copy of the Septuagint for his inspection. The manuscript was wrapped up in a piece of red cloth, and, on being unrolled, Tischendorf discovered to his surprise and delight, that it was the identical document he was so anxiously seeking, a treasure he had recently concluded he would never have an opportunity of beholding. He had long wished to complete a fragmentary copy of the Septuagint, but, on turning over the manuscripts how triumphant was his gladness, to discover, in addition to this, a copy of the Greek New Testament, not defective even in the smallest portion—*ne minima quidem lacuna deformatum*—together with the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. These precious manuscripts, with the steward's permission,

he carried from the monk's apartments to his own room, that he might there in solitude give vent to his feelings, rejoice over his treasure, and render thanks to his Heavenly Father, who had so wonderfully prospered him in his work, and conferred so great a favor upon the Church. There were no bounds to his joy. No California explorer ever opened a mine with the ecstasy which he experienced. The accumulation of wealth, a successful canvass for high office, or the most brilliant military achievement could not have awakened in his breast greater exultation and deeper gratitude. Unable to sleep, he spent the whole night in the cold room and with a dim light, transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas,* which was appended to the New Testament, and which in the original had, for centuries, been assiduously sought for by critics.

The following day Tischendorf obtained the consent of the fraternity to have the manuscripts forwarded to him at Cario for transcription, provided Agathangelus, their ecclesiastical superior in Egypt, would make no objection. His permission was granted, and, within the brief space of two months, the whole Codex, embracing more than one hundred thousand lines, was copied by the industrious Professor with the aid of two friends, whose labors, letter by letter, he himself carefully revised. After the matter was once copied, the manuscript itself was not of so much importance to him. He felt that he could not be deprived of his copy, even if the monks should make a requisition upon him for the return of the original, or should dispose of it in another direction. He very judiciously, however, suggested to the fraternity the propriety of presenting the document, as a tribute of regard, to the Emperor Alexander, the acknowledged head and patron of the Greek Church. To this proposition they agreed, and Tischendorf was made the medium of its presentation. The same year the manuscripts were brought to St. Petersburg, and committed to the custody of his Imperial Majesty, by whose orders they were, for a fortnight, opened and exposed to the gaze and examination of the public. Thus

*This Epistle had a very high authority in the third century of the Christian Church. It was regarded by many as inspired, and placed side by side with the New Testament. For this reason, it, no doubt, found its place among the manuscripts of the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

apparently by accident, these valuable manuscripts, considered, at first, as useless, seemed to have been preserved from destruction; apparently by accident they were discovered by the inexhaustible student and critical scholar, whose valuable labors have made them the property, of the Christian world.

After the discovery and transportation of these manuscripts to Europe, the next step in their history is their publication. Under the superintendence of Dr. Tischendorf, the Emperor, in 1862, ordered the printing of three hundred copies—a *fac simile* in folio of the original—two hundred of which he retained as presentation copies for the principal public libraries of Europe, and the remainder he generously gave to the Editor for his own use, in grateful recognition of his faithful and valuable services. Some-what more than a year later the Professor issued the New Testament portion of the manuscript in the ordinary Greek characters, accompanied with Prolegomena and notes.* This work is now within the reach of all Biblical scholars, and will always prove an important aid in the critical study of the New Testament, particularly in the present day, an age of great intellectual activity and research in every department of literary and scientific inquiry.

Tischendorf gives, as the result of his labors and research, the following enumeration of the manuscripts he secured for the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg: 1. Twelve Palimpsests; 2. Twenty Uncial Greek; 3. Twenty-two cursive Greek; 4. Nine Syriac; 5. Eleven Copts; 6. Seven Arabic with some fragments of Turkish; 7. Nine Hebrew of the most ancient and rare Rabinic recensions; 11. Five Armenian; 12. Two of Papyrus with a Greek astrolabe. Among these choice manuscripts are, also, included the Scholia of Origen on the Book of Proverbs. But the most valuable part of the whole collection to Tischendorf was the manuscript of the entire Greek Bible, and the Apocryphal Books, discovered in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, and written most probably in the time of the Emperor Constantine.

*The copy before us has the following title page: "Novum Testamentum Græce. Ex Sinaitico Codice omnium antiquissimo, Vaticana itemque Elizeviriana lectione notata Edidit Ænoth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf Dr. Theol. et Phil. Palaeogr. Bibl. etc, etc. Cum Tabula. Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus. 1865.

This remarkable *Codex* contains of the Old Testament, portions of the Chronicles, the Poetical Books from Job to the Song of Solomon inclusive, Isaiah with a part of, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets with the exception of Hosea, Amos and Micah, and of the Apocryphal Books, Tobit, Judith, a portion of the Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. The New Testament contains: 1. The Gospels; 2. The Epistles of Paul; 3. The Acts of the Apostles; 4. The Catholic Epistles; 5. The Apocalypse; 6. The Epistle of Barnabas with fragments of Hermas. The *Codex Sinaiticus* is unlike the common version in the order of its arrangement. It differs in this respect, also, from the *Codex Vaticanus*,* although like it, there is in the original manuscripts no divisions of the Gospels into chapters. In the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the authorized English version of the New Testament Scriptures, there is often a marked difference in the text, but these very differences serve to remove obscurities and shed additional light upon the sacred volume. Its testimony is valuable as an aid in determining the conflicting claims of passages of Scripture which have been the subjects of protracted discussion.

The *Codex Sinaiticus* is, then, an important contribution to Biblical criticism and theological literature. All who are interested in the purity of God's Word, value its discovery, and gratefully appreciate the services of its diligent and learned critic. Said a savant of Europe in reference to the discovery of the manuscript: "I would rather have found the *Codex Sinaiticus* than the *Kohinoor*† of the Queen of England." Statesmen and scholars of all countries have expressed their congratulations and thanks to the German Philologist for his valuable contributions to sacred learning. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge conferred upon him their highest Academic honors. Even the Pope of Rome sent him an autograph letter, in grateful acknowledgement and ardent admiration of his persistent and successful efforts. "But far above all these flattering demonstrations," says Dr. Tischendorf, "do I re-

*The *Codex Vaticanus* is supposed to have had its origin in the fourth century, before the time of Eusebius, and is also written in uncial letter, although not so regular as the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

†*Kohinoor* means *Mountain of Light*, a precious diamond, valued at more than a million of dollars.

gard the conviction, that it has pleased God to strengthen the faith of believers in this age of infidel and unchristian attacks on his Word, by giving them this copy of the Scriptures, as a sure and living light, by which the authenticity of the written word is firmly established."

For the last three centuries Biblical critics have faithfully and earnestly labored to give the public a careful and satisfactory text of the New Testament in its original. Every new discovery of manuscripts has suggested some changes, either substitutions or additions, but all these suggestions, like the *Codex Sinaiticus*, are only cumulative evidence of the essential integrity of the ordinary text. Nothing has been presented to impair our confidence in the inspiration of God's Word, or to effect a material change in its teachings. We are only the more fully confirmed in the conviction and strengthened in the impression, that the representations contained in the Bible, the doctrines and lessons it inculcates, are to be received as divinely authoritative, as "the Oracles of God."

ARTICLE VII.

HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR WORSHIP?*

By J. A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.

Social and public worship is an institution of God himself, and has always been observed by his people, in all nations and ages. Jesus has given special promises to those who are gathered together in his name. Matt. 18: 20. It was in the assemblies of his disciples, when they were together for devotion, that he particularly manifested himself after his resurrection. It was whilst "they were all with one accord in one place," that the Holy Ghost was first so miraculously poured out. Acts 2: 1-17. And

*"Church Book. For the use of Evangelical Lutheran congregations. By authority of the General Council, &c., Phila: Lutheran Book Store, 807 Vine st., 1868."

the word of the inspired apostle is: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." Heb. 10: 22-25.

It is also a matter of importance how these assemblies are regulated, and how the duties for which they meet are to be discharged. These are things which certainly cannot be safely left to the hazards of the moment, or to the option of each individual will. Community of action, presupposes concert, agreement, and some well understood plan. We learn from the writings of Paul, that some of the highest and most miraculous impulses of the spirit may become disorderly, unedifying, and the means of shameful confusion, if not made subject to certain laws of decorum and propriety. Even the spirit of prophecy, in these public assemblies, must be brought into subjection, and take its place in order, and obey the pre-arranged judgment by which the whole service is to be governed. 1 Cor. 14: 23-40. A hap-hazard gathering, and a hap-hazard way of dealing with the sacred things of Divine worship, do by no means meet the requirements upon which the apostle insists. People, when they come to worship God, must know what they are about, what it is that they are to do, and how, and in what order they are to do it. And even if the spirit of God is strong upon them, so that they can speak with tongues which they have never learned, and preach with the divine illumination of a prophet, and sing with all the devotion of a saint, if more than one speak at a time, or one sings while the other preaches, or one prays while the other exhorts, the whole thing becomes a scene of confusion and disorder, a mere burlesque and disgrace.

It has, therefore, from the very beginning, been a subject of serious attention among right-minded Christians, how to regulate and direct the exercises of their assemblies for worship.

We sometimes hear people blurting against Liturgies, against forms, against any prescribed order of service. But the most charitable construction that can be put upon it is, that such people do not know what they say. No assembly can join in worship without *doing something*; and if they do something, there must be some way in which they do it; and that way of doing what is done, is their *Liturgy*—their order of service—their ritual,

their form. That way of doing things may be extemporized for the occasion, or it may be followed as a matter of custom and common consent without being written or printed in a book, but it is still a form; a style of doing, a ritual, by which the exercises are governed. Just as there can be no religion and no church fellowship without a creed, written or unwritten; so there can be no public worship without an order of service, either expressed or understood beforehand, or arbitrarily dictated and acquiesced in, at the time. If congregations have settled customs of worship, though not a line concerning them be written, those customs constitute their ritual, their Liturgy. If congregations have no regular customs of worship, but leave everything in the meeting to be directed and arranged by the leader at the time, still, nothing can go on till the rubric is in some way given, and what is to be done next is indicated. If some one rises and says, "Let us sing;" it is the announcement of a Liturgical rubric. If he says, Sing such a hymn; it is the prescription of a form of words, in which that part of the worship is to be performed. If he says, "Let us pray;" it is the announcement of another Liturgical rubric; and if he prays, whether his prayer be written or extemporized, it is a form of words in which the whole congregation is expected to join in the address to God. And so throughout. There can be neither beginning, middle, nor end, without some given rubric and form. Hence, the rejection of premeditated and fixed Liturgical formularies, necessitates the greatest extravagance in Liturgy-making, a new one being required for each recurring service, which, of all sorts of Liturgy-making, is infinitely the worst. The difference between those who have written forms, arranged and fixed beforehand, and those who have none, is that the one class determine to conduct their worship according to the best judgment of the whole congregation and the whole church, whilst the others leave it to the arbitrary dictation of this one, or that, who perhaps has never given the subject an hour's thought, and yet takes upon him, from the mere impulse of the moment, to indicate how the people are to order the most solemn acts, which man can perform on earth.

Let it be understood, then, that a *Liturgy* or a *ritual*, is simply the order that is followed when people come together to

unite in the worship of God. It matters not, whether that order be written and printed in a book in the hands of the worshippers, or in unwritten customs which they follow without knowing why, or in the unstudied directions which the minister or leader gives at the moment; it is still a form, an order, a *Liturgy*. And there can be no public worship without one.

As there must, therefore, be a form, to direct what is to be done first, and second, and third, and fourth, and who is to do it, and how it is to be done; to make known when there is to be silence, and when there is to be speaking; to indicate when there is to be singing, and when there is to be praying; and to give beginning, continuation and end to the service, it must be evident to every reasonable mind, that that form ought not to be left to the caprice or hazard of the instant, but should be carefully considered, arranged, and settled beforehand, by the best judgment and wisdom which the Church can command.

First of all, the Scriptures themselves are to be carefully searched, and every hint and direction carefully treasured and embodied. From these sacred records we are particularly to search out and settle what things properly belong to a Divine service, so that we may know that what we do is acceptable to God. Nor has any one a right to add to, or to take from, what God has ordained and set forth as acts and elements of His worship. But in order that all these things may be properly embraced, and have their due place and prominence, it is needful that there should be careful study and premeditation, and that the order to be followed should not be left to the chances of the hour.

In the next place, the experience and practice of the people of God, in general, are to be consulted; and what has met with general favor in the best ages, and been approved by the Church in its purest parts, is not to be treated lightly, or set aside without cogent and satisfactory reasons. What has been sanctioned always, everywhere, and by the best and purest of the churches, to whom, if to any, God's promise of the Holy Ghost, to guide into the way of truth, has been fulfilled, we may safely accept, and confidently adopt. Under the Scriptures, and next to the Scriptures, the voice of the Church is the best light that exists.

But times change, and men and manners change with them, so that every age has its own peculiarities, and its own particular humor and necessities. These have also to be taken into consideration. They dare not be allowed to weigh against anything which God has spoken, nor yet to set aside anything that the Church has everywhere and always received and practiced. But there is always a margin of details of method and usage left to the liberty of the churches, and which must be filled up, according to the requirements or convenience of the times. And this, also, needs to be done with judgment and discretion, requiring deliberation and settlement in some other way than the mere caprice of the moment.

How evidently much better it is, therefore, that all the leading aspects of worship, and whatever relates to its proper rendering, should be settled and established by the united wisdom of such churches as are connected in one fellowship. Not all congregations, or leaders of the worship in congregations, are alike intelligent, prudent, or capacitated to act in such a case. There needs to be mutual counselling, and the deliberation of the best minds, and the sense of the most devout hearts, and the judgment of the most disciplined and cultivated tastes, in order to do the thing properly. And when this has been had, it becomes an act of duty and correct Christian ethics, for individuals to lay aside their personal predilections and preferences, to sacrifice their particular likes and dislikes, and with heartiness to acquiesce in the best and deliberate judgment of the body, of which they claim to be a part.

The scanty records of the primitive Church, do not enable us to say for certain, that any fixed or written form of public worship was instituted by the apostles, or enjoined by them upon their disciples. It is, indeed, expressly stated in the book of the Acts, that the Church was no sooner established, than it united and held together by common acts of devotion. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Acts 2: 42. It may also be gathered from some passages in the Acts, and in the Epistles of St. Paul, that special meetings of the believers were held on the first day of the week, and that the Lord's Supper was celebrated at the time of the common meal. This latter practice led to certain abuses in the Corinthian Church, which were censured by the apostle. 1 Cor. 11: 21.

And as we thus find him setting in order certain irregularities in the method of conducting Divine service, it is hardly possible that the infant churches did not receive apostolic instructions on the subject in general. On the contrary, among the "traditions," which St. Paul gave to his disciples, there most likely were directions, more or less definite, on this head. Liturgies are indeed extant, which bear the venerable names of St. James and St. Mark; but as they cannot be traced back to the first age, and at no period were universally accredited as the work of apostolic men, we are not justified in assigning to them, at least in any considerable portion, such high antiquity and authority. Still, churches existed under the apostles, and worship was celebrated; and some approved method of doing it, must also have existed.

Descending to the age which immediately succeeded the apostles, the commencement of the second century, we find reason to believe that fixed forms of public devotion were at that time in use, which must necessarily have originated in large part with the apostles. Justin Martyr, in his *First Apology*, written about A. D. 140, and presented to the Roman Emperor and Senate, in the name of all Christians, gives a description of the worship as it was celebrated in his time, which looks as if the thing were well settled and understood among Christians generally. After describing the baptism of a catechumen, he says:

"We offer prayers in common for ourselves, for the baptized person, and for all men." This is after the sermon. "Then there is brought to the presiding brother a portion of bread, and a cup of mixed water and wine: he takes it, and offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and returns thanks to Him for having vouchsafed to give us these things. When he has made an end of both the prayers and the thanksgiving, the people answer *Amen*, which in Hebrew signifies, *So be it*. Then those whom we call deacons give to each person present, a portion of the bread, and wine and water, over which the thanksgiving has been said, and they also carry away to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist, which no one may receive, except those who believe in the truth of our doctrines, and who have also been baptized for the remission of sins, and who live according to the commandments of Christ." Soon afterwards, he speaks of "the food, over which thanks are given

in the words of His [Christ's] prayer," thus showing that the repetition of the Lord's prayer was part of the eucharistic service; and a little further on, he says: "On Sunday, as the day is called, the inhabitants of town and country assemble together, and the memoirs of the apostles and writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. When the reader has finished, the presiding brother makes a discourse, exhorting us to the imitation of these worthies. Then we stand up and pray; and when the prayers are done, bread and wine are brought, as I have just described, and he who presides, sends up thanksgivings and prayers, as well as he is able, and the people answer *Amen*." This was written about one hundred years after the death of Christ, and about twenty-five years after the death of the apostle John.

In the year 325, Cyril, of Jerusalem, delivered a series of catechetical lectures, in one of which he describes and explains the communion service, as it was celebrated in his day, where he says: "The minister cries aloud, 'Lift up your hearts.'" "For," says he, "we ought indeed, at that solemn season to have our heart on high with God, and not below, thinking of earth and earthly things. Then ye answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' Then the minister says, 'Let us give thanks to the Lord.' Then ye say, 'It is meet and right.' After this, we make mention of heaven and earth; of angels and archangels, and of the seraphim whom Isaiah saw encircling the throne of God, and who cried, 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth.' And we repeat this confession of the seraphim, that we may join our hymns with those of the heavenly hosts. Then having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we call upon God to send his Holy Spirit upon the gifts of bread and wine lying before Him. Then we entreat God for the peace of the Church and the world, for kings, for soldiers, for the sick and afflicted, and all who stand in need of help. Then we commemorate those who have fallen asleep before us. Then we say the Lord's Prayer. After this, the minister says, 'Holy things to holy men.' Then ye say, 'One only is holy, one only is the Lord Jesus Christ.' After this the chanter, with a holy melody, invites you to the communion of the holy mysteries, saying, 'O taste, and see that the Lord is good.' Then ye receive, not common bread and wine. Then follows a prayer and thanksgiving.—*Humphry on the Book of Common Prayer, Bingham, Riddle and others.*

These particulars are mentioned in detail, because they furnish about all that is known of the form of Divine worship practiced in the churches of the first centuries, and that it may be seen how thoroughly the authorized Liturgies of our own Church have taken in, and been modeled after the practice of the most eminent Christians, next following the inspired apostles.

From the fourth century onward, all the churches we know of, had their regular and established orders of service, which were everywhere very punctiliously observed. There were some minor variations in different sections of the world, but in substance, universal Christendom performed its worship, as Justin Martyr and Cyril say it was performed in their time.

But, whilst all churches retained, in substance, and mostly in the very words, the forms found in use soon after the apostles' times, there is no country in which additions were not made, and a multiplication of rites and ceremonies invented, which were gradually engrafted upon the primitive worship. Two tendencies in the Church, the one Judaizing and the other Heathenizing, both contributed to this; which was greatly facilitated by the incoming of false conceptions of religion itself, and by the lordly pomp and distinction which were bestowed upon certain orders, established among the clergy. And thus, from the Pagan temples, the Hebrew ceremonies, the imperial courts, and the fancies of men of all descriptions, Christendom came to be overlaid with a complicated "Ritualism," as interminable and multitudinous in its extent, as it was fantastic in its character, and crushing to Gospel truth and piety in its effects.

It would require volumes to describe all the rites, ceremonies, and farcical performances, high and low, great and small, for living and dead, for persons and things, which were made to pass under the name of Christian worship. But as a good deal is said about "*the ceremonies of the Mass*;" and as we find in them a full picture of the manner in which the highest acts of Christian worship eventually came to be administered in the western church; it may, at least, be well to enter into a somewhat particular detail of them.

The various actions of the priest in celebrating Mass, are enumerated as thirty-five, all said to be Symbolic and significant.

1. He goes to the altar, in which we are to see the Saviour's retreat to the garden of Olives.

2. He says a preparatory prayer, also with a mystic signification, referring to the exclusion from Paradise.

3. He makes confession of sin, denoting the burden with which Christ wrestled.

4. He kisses the altar, referring to the Saviour's betrayal with a kiss, and in token of reconciliation with God.

5. He goes to the Epistle-side of the altar and perfumes it, supposing the taking and binding of Christ.

6. He says the Introit, which is to signify the carrying of the Saviour before Caiaphas.

7. He sings, Lord, have mercy upon us, three times over, in allusion to Peter's threefold denial of his Lord.

8. He turns to the altar and says, The Lord be with you, which is to call up Christ's look upon Peter.

9. He reads the Epistle, which is to connect with the accusation of Jesus before Pilate.

10. He bows before the altar and says, Cleanse our hearts, which is Christ being accused before Herod.

11. He reads the Gospel, which signifies Christ's being sent from Herod to Pilate.

12. He uncovers the chalice, which is to represent the stripping of our Lord to be scourged.

13. He kisses the altar and offers the host, which is the scourging of Christ.

14. He elevates, and then covers the chalice, signifying the crowning with thorns.

15. He washes his fingers, which figures Pilate declaring Christ innocent, and blesses the bread, wine and frankincense.

16. He turns to the people, says, Let us pray, and addresses the Trinity in a low voice, which is to represent Christ being clothed with the purple robe.

17. He says the Preface, which is Christ given over for crucifixion.

18. He joins his hands and prays for the faithful that are living, in allusion to Christ bearing his cross upon which to die that we might live.

19. He covers the host and chalice with a cloth, which is St. Veronica offering Christ her handkerchief.

20. He makes the sign of the cross, signifying that Jesus is nailed to the cross.

21. He adores the host and raises it up, figuring Christ lifted up upon the cross.

22. He consecrates the chalice, and elevates it, which is the shedding of Christ's blood upon the cross.

23. He says the *Memento* for the faithful in purgatory, in allusion to Christ's prayer for His enemies.

24. He raises his voice, smites his breast, and begs God's blessing for the sake of saints he names, which is the dying thief imploring a place in Paradise.

25. He elevates the host and cup, says the Lord's prayer, makes the sign of the cross on the host, chalice and altar, which is Mary, bid to look on St. John as her son.

26. He makes a private prayer to God for peace, through the Virgin Mary and the saints, puts the host upon the paten, and breaks it; which is Christ giving up the ghost.

27. He puts a bit of the host into the chalice, which is Christ descending into hell.

28. He says, and the people sing *Agnus Dei*, three times, which is the return home, smiting their breasts, of those who saw the Lord's sufferings.

29. He says a private prayer for the peace of the Church, kisses the altar, and the pax, which is handed to the people to be kissed, takes the communion himself, and gives to the people, which is to represent Christ making peace by His cross.

30. He puts wine into the chalice, takes what is called an ablution, repeats a short prayer, pours out wine and water for a second ablution, which he takes with a short prayer; which is the washing and embalming of Christ's body.

31. He sings the prayer for the good effect of the sacrament in the revival of Christians, which figures the Saviour's resurrection.

32. He salutes the congregation, which is the message of peace from the risen Christ.

33. He reads from the Gospel, which is Christ appearing to His mother and disciples.

34. He dismisses the people, which is Christ's ascension into heaven.

35. The Benediction is given, which is the descent of the Holy Ghost from the ascended Christ.

The occasion being one of particular solemnity, and a bishop officiating, the canons and other officers of the Church, receive and wait upon him in state; the organ

plays ; the master of ceremonies gives the sprinkler to the head canon, who presents it to the bishop, after kissing both it and the bishop's hand. His lordship first sprinkles himself, then the canons, in the name of the Trinity, and proceeds to say a prayer at a particular desk before the altar. He goes to the high altar and repeats the same form, then withdraws into the vestry to receive the vestments suitable for the great solemnity. The sub-deacon takes from a little closet the episcopal sandals and stockings, elevates them, presents them to the bishop, kneels, takes off the bishop's shoes and stockings, while six or eight acolytes, dressed in their robes, kneel around him. Two acolytes, having washed their hands, take the sacred habiliments, hold them up, give them to two deacon assistants, to put them on the bishop, after he has solemnly washed his hands. The deacon salutes the bishop, takes off his upper garment, and puts on his amict, the cross of which he kisses. Then they give him the alb, the girdle, the cross for his breast, the stole, and the pluvial. He kisses the cross which is upon each of them, and they kiss the vestments put on him. As soon as he is seated, they put his mitre on his head, and present him with the pastoral ring. The deacon then gives him his right glove, and the sub-deacon his left, with kisses of the gloves, and of the hands to wear them. Ejaculatory prayers are connected with each piece of the episcopal robes, which, also, has its particular significance. The stole is the yoke of the Gospel ; the change of foot-gear refers to Moses putting off his shoes ; the dalmatica, which is in the form of a cross, tells of crucifixion to the world ; the alb refers to the purity of the priest's soul ; the pastoral ring denotes the bishop's spiritual marriage with the Church ; the gloves, his insensibility to good works, or the employment of his hands for spiritual ends ; the girdle is the emblem of justice and virtue ; the sandals, of his walk in the paths of the Lord. The two horns of the mitre, are the Old and New Testaments ; the shepherd's crook, his paternal authority ; the pluvial, the remembrancer of the miseries and temptations of life.

Thus arrayed, all the clergy range themselves around him. Two canons or deacons place themselves one on each side, both in their dalmaticas, and after them, a deacon and a sub-deacon. The incense-bearer appears with a censer, and a priest with a navet, out of which the bishop

takes incense, puts it into the censer. Then he kisses the cross upon the vestry altar, and goes in procession to the altar, where Mass is to be celebrated. The incense bearer walks at the head of the procession: two wax candle bearers, with lighted tapers in their hands, march next, on either side of him who bears the cross, and the rest of the clergy follow. The sub-deacon, who is to sing the epistle, carries before his breast a copy of the New Testament, shut, with the bishop's maniple in it. A deacon and a priest, with their pluvials on, march before the bishop, who meekly leans on his two deacon assistants, with the crook in his left hand, and his right somewhat raised to give his benediction to those Christians whom he meets in the way. Having reached the altar, he salutes his clergy with one bow of the head. When on the lowest step, he gives the crook to the sub-deacon, and the deacon takes off his mitre. Then all make a profound bow to the cross on the altar, after which, the clergy all withdraw, except the sub-deacon who has charge of the crook, the incense-bearer, two deacons, one priest-assistant, who stands at the bishop's right hand, one deacon at his left, and one more behind him. The bishop then says the confession, and the sub-deacon takes the maniple from the book, kisses it, presents it to the bishop to be kissed, kisses the bishop's hand, and puts the maniple on his left arm. Meanwhile the canons repeat the confession. The bishop then goes to the altar, leans toward it, extends his arms upon the table of it, and affectionately kisses it in the middle, while he makes mention of the sacred relics placed in it. The sub-deacon then presents him with the New Testament, which he kisses. The incense-bearer comes forward with censer and navet, which he gives to the deacon, and the deacon to the bishop, that the incense may be blessed. The person who officiates then takes the censer, perfumes the altar, gives it back to the deacon, takes the mitre, goes to the epistle-side, and is thrice perfumed by the deacon who holds the censer. The bishop then kisses the holy cross, takes the crosier in his left hand, and, leaning upon his deacon-assistants, goes to his episcopal throne. There, laying aside his mitre, and, making the sign of the cross from the forehead down to the breast, he reads the Introit out of a Mass-book, which an assistant holds before him, whilst another holds up a wax taper. The two deacon-assistants point with their fingers to the place where he is

to read ; and then all sing in Greek, Lord have mercy upon us ; after which the bishop puts on his mitre and his gremial, or sacerdotal apron, and takes his seat, with the two deacon-assistants, one on each side of him, and an assistant-priest on a stool. They all rise when the singing is finished, the bishop turning to the altar and giving out the *Gloria*, which he continues saying with his ministers. The reading of the Gospel is ushered in by a procession : the master of ceremonies, the incense-bearer, light-bearers with burning tapers, and others, passing in review before the altar, and saluting it on bended knees, as they pass.

At length, comes the sermon ; though this may be omitted, in which case the creed is, at once, proceeded with, and the offertory, after the same style as all the rest. The bishop ceremonially washes his hands, the ring and gloves being removed by assistants. He goes to the altar, two acolytes put a veil over his shoulders, covering, also, the sacred vessels, which veil must hang a little lower on the right side, than the left. Then he takes the chalice and paten with his left hand, his right lying lightly over the veil. When he elevates the host, the deacon who kneels on his right side, takes up the border of the celebrant's planet, also at the elevation of the chalice, and the acolyte incenses the body and blood of the Lord three times, whilst the holy candles are all burning. And the rest of the service is concluded as before described.*

It seems as if pardon ought to be asked for this recital of details so puerile, absurd and fantastical. But what must it then be to enact and perform them, as the highest and most sacred Christian worship ! Yet, such is what the services of religion had become at the time of the Reformation, and what they still are in the Roman Catholic churches. There is, also, need to tell out the whole thing faithfully, that it may be seen what that "Ritualism" is, about which so much is very loosely said and written.

It is, also, to be remembered, that this was the mode of celebrating Christian worship, which Luther found in vogue when the truth of God first dawned upon his mind, that it was against this pantomime and mummary, in the name of Christ and religion, he set himself with the heroism of an apostle ; that it was from such fantasies and wickedness he labored, and wrote, and suffered, to deliver and separate the true, pure and original rites and services of the re-

* See Burder's Religious Ceremonies.

ligion of Jesus; and, that it was as breakwaters against such abominations as these on the one hand, and against the evaporation of the legitimate Christian rites, into irreverent and empty common-places on the other, that the purified and written Liturgies of our Church were established and fixed in all the nations, which embraced the Lutheran Reformation.

Luther himself put forth the first outlines of a Reformed service, demanding that the worship should be celebrated in the language used by the people, and going back again to the simplicities of the Scriptures, and the primitive forms, as the churches next after the apostles used them. "Ritualism," as practiced in the Romish churches, and so enthusiastically sought to be copied by some misnamed Protestants, has never, anywhere, had place or countenance in any Lutheran churches under the sun. From Luther until now, in all nations, and under all conditions, the Lutheran Church disowns, discountenances and condemns everything of the sort. She is not, however, a Church of mere negations, crying down what she found, with nothing to put in its place. Luther's work was not destruction, but *reformation*—the bringing to nought of the ruinous fancies and follies of men, and the conservation of the true, original, and proper, scriptural and apostolic, Church of Jesus Christ.

The Lutheran Church, therefore, has her Liturgies and settled forms of worship. She has had them from the beginning, just as the Church next after the Apostles had them. She does not seek to enforce their use, as if there could be no Christianity without them, or as conditions of church-fellowship or salvation; confessing, as she does, that "It is not necessary that human traditions, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere;" and that "It is sufficient to the true unity of the Church to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." (Aug. Conf. Art. VII.) But she has given her testimony, clear and distinct, before all men and all angels, and fully recorded her profound conviction and judgment, as to what is a rightly ordered, true and scriptural administration of the rites and ordinances of Christianity. It is, also, from her revision and reformation of the Christian ritual, that all churchly Protestant Liturgies have taken their principal features and character. The English Book of Common Prayer, was

originally taken almost bodily from the Lutheran Liturgies, and from the various forms of devotion sifted out of the papacy, arranged by the Lutheran Reformers. Other elements, Romanistic, Puritanic, and Calvinistic have been since introduced into that book, much marring its consistency and beauty in sundry particulars, as can readily be shown. But wherein it still conforms to the Lutheran service, men mistake, and reverse history and truth, by supposing that we are copying and imitating Episcopalians when we seek to bring out, and to put into use the true and proper service which our Church had framed, recorded, and used, before the English Book of Common Prayer was thought of. So far as there is any copying or imitation in the case, it is England that has copied and followed the Lutherans, and not Lutherans, England.

It has been our misfortune, owing to causes which can easily be traced, that we have never, until now, had a full official rendering of the proper Lutheran service in the English language, particularly in this country. In German we have had it. The writer has in his possession, a copy of a German Liturgy, published in Philadelphia, in the year 1786, by authority of the only Synod of our Church, then in this country, which was in use in the old mother congregation, on Fourth street, in the days of Helmut and Schmidt, whose names are attached to it, in which the features and characteristics of the proper Lutheran service are contained. The *Confession* is there, in which the people were to join. The *Kyrie* is there, to be sung or said by all the worshippers. The *Responses* are there for the congregation to take part in audibly, as well as the preacher. The regular Epistolary and Gospel *Lessons* are there, to be read in every morning service. The *Litany* is there, with direction that it should not be omitted without necessity. Offertory verses are directed to be sung after the sermon, and then the general prayer. Thus, the fathers ordered their worship; and it was Lutheran. But so it has not entirely been with their descendants. Our English Churches have been copyists; and have copied largely after the less churchly denominations around them, to their own and their Church's disadvantage.

Long has the wish and effort of many been to return to the ways of our fathers, from which others enriched themselves, and then boasted that what they had, was of their making. But, until very recently, the means of thus fairly repre-

senting ourselves in English, and of conforming our English services to what they are in all other languages, have not been realized. At last, however, we have our Church service in English, embodying the consensus of all original Lutheran Liturgies, set forth by authority, and recommended for the adoption of all our churches.

The *Church Book*, which contains it, is before the public. It is the greatest book that our Church has yet issued on this side of the sea. It should be examined and studied by every Lutheran. At some other time we may take up more particularly the *Order of Service* which it proposes. Quite sure are we, that it needs only to be understood, to be approved.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE REFORMATION : ITS OCCASIONS AND CAUSE.

By PROFESSOR CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia.

The day before "All-Saint's Day."

The immediate occasion of the Reformation seemed insignificant enough. Three hundred and fifty-one years ago, on the 31st of October, immense crowds were pouring into an ancient city of Germany, bearing in its name, Wittenberg, the memorial of its founder, Wittekind the Younger. The weather-beaten and dingy little edifices of Wittenberg forbade the idea, that the beauty of the city, or its commercial importance drew the masses to it. Within that city was an old church, very miserable and battered, and very venerable and holy, which attracted these crowds. It was the "Church of All-Saints," in which were shown, to the inexpressible delight of the faithful, a fragment of Noah's Ark, some soot from the furnace into which the three young Hebrews were cast, a piece of wood from the crib of the infant Saviour, some of St. Christopher's beard, and nineteen thousand other relics equally genuine and interesting. But over and above all these allurements, so well adapted to the taste of the time, His Holiness, the Pope, had granted indulgence to all who should visit the

church on the first of November. Against the door of that church of dubious saints, and dubious relics, and dubious indulgences, was found fastened on that memorable morning, a scroll unrolled. The writing on it was firm; the nails which held it were well driven in; the sentiments it conveyed were moderate, yet very decided. The material, parchment, was the same which long ago had held words of redemption above the head of the Redeemer. The contents were an amplification of the old theme of glory—Christ on the cross, the only king. The Magna Charta, which had been buried beneath the Pope's throne, reappeared on the church door. The key note of the Reformation was struck full and clear at the beginning, Salvation through Christ alone.

It is from the nailing up of these Theses the Reformation takes its date. That act became, in the providence of God, the starting-point of the work which still goes on, and shall forever go on, that glorious work in which the truth was raised to its original purity, and civil and religious liberty were restored to men. That the Reformation is the spring of modern freedom, is no wild assertion of its friends. One of the greatest Roman Catholic writers of recent times, Michelet, in the Introduction to his Life of Luther, says:—"It is not incorrect to say, that Luther has been the restorer of liberty in modern times. If he did not create, he at least courageously affixed his signature to that great revolution which rendered the right of examination lawful in Europe. And, if we exercise, in all its plenitude at this day, this first and highest privilege of human intelligence, it is to him we are mostly indebted for it; nor can we think, speak, or write, without being made conscious, at every step, of the immense benefit of this intellectual enfranchisement;" and he concludes with the remark: "To whom do I owe the power of publishing what I am now inditing, except to this liberator of modern thought?" Our Church, as clearly in one sense, the mother of the Reformation, as in another, she is its offspring, the first, and for a time, the exclusive possessor of the name Protestantism, its source and its mightiest bulwark, our Church has wisely set apart a day in each year to commemorate this great deliverance, and wisely has kept her great Jubilees. There are other ways of noting time, besides by its loss. The Church Festivals note it by its gains, the Church Year

marks the time which has been redeemed for ever. An old writer describes the Church of All-Saints at Wittenberg, as a manger, where in his lowly glory the Son of God was born again. Blessed forever be the day ! On it, through all time, men shall gather, bringing their offerings of praise ; remembering, treasuring, and keeping untarnished, the holy faith whose restoration was thus begun.

It is well, then, to have added to the grand order of the Church Year, the Festival of the Reformation, and to the revolution of the centuries its Jubilee. Whether as the child or as the parent of the Reformation, whether she would awake her heart to gratitude as its daughter, or arouse herself to an earnest sense of responsibility as its mother, our Church can claim it, as pre-eminently her privilege, and acknowledge it as pre-eminently her duty so to do. When the Festival of the Reformation shall come and shall wake no throb of joy in her bosom, her life will have fled. For if the Reformation lives through her, she also lives by it. It has to her the mysterious relation of Christ to David ; if it is her offspring, it is also her root. If she watched the ark of the Lord, the ark of the Lord protected and blessed her, and when it passes from her keeping her glory will have departed. Let her speak to her children then, and tell them the meaning of the day. In the pulpit, and the school, and the circle of the home, let these great memories of men of God, of their self-sacrifice, of their overcoming faith, and of their glorious work, be the theme of thought, and of word, and of thanksgiving. The Festival of the Reformation is at once a day of Christmas and of Easter, and of Pentecost in our Church year ; a day of birth, a day of resurrection, a day of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Let its return renew that life, and make our Church press on with fresh vigor in the steps of her risen Lord, as one begotten again, and born from the dead, by the quickening power of the Spirit of her God. Let every day be a Festival of the Reformation, and every year a Jubilee.

Specific Occasion and Cause of the Reformation.

The occasion and cause of so wonderful and important an event as the Reformation have naturally occupied very largely the thoughts of both its friends and its foes. On the part of its enemies the solution of its rapid rise, its gigantic growth, its overwhelming march, has been found by

some in the rancor of monkish malice—the thing arose in a squabble between two sets of friars, about the farming of the indulgences—a solution as sapient and as completely in harmony with the facts as would be the statement that the American Revolution was gotten up by one George Washington, who, angry that the British Government refused to make him a collector of the tax on tea, stirred up a happy people to rebellion against a mild and just rule.

The solution has been found by others in the lust of the human heart for change—it was begotten in the mere love of novelty, men went into the Reformation as they go into a menagerie, or adopt the new mode, or buy up some “Nordist’s last.” Another class, among whom the brilliant French Jesuit, Audin, is conspicuous, attribute the movement mainly to the personal genius, and fascinating audacity of the great leader in the movement. Luther so fascinated the millions with his marvelous speech and magic style, that they were led at his will. On the part of some, its nominal friends, reasons hardly more adequate have often been assigned. Confounding the mere aids, or at most, the mere occasions of the Reformation with its real causes, an undue importance has been attributed in the production of it to the progress of the arts and sciences after the revival of letters. Much stress has been laid upon the invention of printing, and the discovery of America, which tended to rouse the minds of men to a new life. Much has been said of the fermenting political discontents of the day, the influence of the great councils in diminishing the authority of the Pope, and much has been made, in general, of the causes whose root is either wholly or in part in the earth. The *Rationalist* represents the Reformation as a triumph of reason over authority. The *Infidel* says, that its power was purely negative; it was a grand subversion; it was mightier than Rome, because it believed less than Rome; it prevailed, not by what it taught, but by what it denied; and it failed of universal triumph simply because it did not deny everything. The insect-minded *sectarian* allows the Reformation very little merit except as it prepared the way for the putting forth, in due time, of the particular twig of Protestantism on which he crawls, and which he imagines bears all the fruit, and gives all the value to the tree. As the little green tenants of the rose-bush argue that the rose was made for the pur-

pose of furnishing them a home and food, so these small speculators find the root of the Reformation in the particular part of Providence which they consent to adopt and patronize. The Reformation, as they take it, originated in the divine plan for furnishing a nursery for sectarian *Aphides*.

But we must have causes which, however feeble, are adapted to the effects. A little fire indeed kindleth a great matter, but however little, it must be genuine fire. Frost will not do, and a painting of flame will not do, though the pencil of Raphael produced it. A little hammer may break a great rock, but that which breaks must be harder and more tenacious than the thing broken. There must be a hand to apply the fire, and air to fan it; it must be rightly placed within the material to be kindled; it must be kept from being smothered. And yet all aids do but enable it to exercise its own nature, and it alone kindles. There must be a hand to wield the hammer, and a heart to move the hand; the rock must be struck with vigor, but the hammer itself is indispensable. God used instruments to apply the fire and wield the hammer; His providence prepared the way for the burning and the breaking. And yet there was but one agency, by which they could be brought to pass. Do we ask what was the agency which was needed to kindle the flame? Do we ask what was it, that was destined to give the stroke whose crash filled earth with wonder, and hell with consternation, and heaven with joy? God himself asks the question, so that it becomes its own answer: "Is not MY WORD like as a fire? Is not MY WORD like the hammer which breaks the rock in pieces?"

It is not without an aim that the Word of God is presented in the language we have just quoted, under two images; as fire and as a hammer. The fire is a type of its inward efficacy, the hammer, of its outward work. The one image shows how it acts on those who admit it, the other how it effects those who harden themselves against it; the one symbolizes the persuasive fervor of that Word by which it makes our hearts burn within us in love to the Son of God, the other is an image of the energy with which in the hands of the King on the holy hill of Zion, it breaks the opposers as with a rod of iron. The fire symbolizes the energy of the Word as a Gospel, which draws the heart to God, the hammer shadows forth its

energy as a law which reveals the terrors of God's justice against transgressors. In both these grand aspects the Word of God was the creator of the Reformation and its mightiest instrument. It aroused the workers, and fitted them for their work; it opened blind eyes, and subdued stubborn hearts. The Reformation is its work and its trophy. However manifold the occasions of the Reformation, *THE WORD*, under God, was its cause.

The Bible in the Middle Ages.

The Word of God kindled the fire of the Reformation. That Word lay smouldering under the ashes of centuries; it broke forth into flame, in Luther and the other Reformers; it rendered them lights which shone and burned inextinguishably; through them it imparted itself to the nations; and from the nations it purged away the dross which had gathered for ages. "The Word of God," says St. Paul, "is not bound." Through the centuries which followed the corruption of Christianity, the Word of God was still in being. In lonely cloisters it was laboriously copied. Years were sometimes spent in finishing a single copy of it, in the elaborate but half barbaric beauty which suited the taste of those times. Gold and jewels, on the massive covers decorated the rich workmanship; costly pictures were painted as ornaments on its margin; the choicest vellum was used for the copies; the rarest records of heathen antiquity were sometimes erased to make way for the nobler treasures of the Oracles of the Most High. There are single copies of the Word, from that mid-world of history, which are a store of art, and the possession of one of which gives a bibliographical renown to the city in whose library it is preserved.

No interdict was yet laid upon the reading of the Word, for none was necessary. The scarceness and costliness of books formed in themselves a barrier more effectual than the interdict of popes and councils. Many of the great teachers in the Church of Rome were devoted students of the Bible. From the earliest writings of the Fathers, down to the Reformation, there is an unbroken line of witnesses for the right of all believers freely to read the Holy Scriptures. No man thought of putting an artificial limitation on its perusal; on the contrary, there are expressions of regret in the mediæval Catholic writers that,

in the nature of the case so few could have access to these precious records.

In communities separate from the Church of Rome, the truth was maintained by reading and teaching the Holy Scriptures. The Albigensian and Waldensian martyrs, were martyrs of the Word :

"Those slaughtered saints whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold,
Even those who kept God's truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones."

The invention of printing, and hardly less the invention of paper made from rags—for what would printing be worth, if we were still confined to so costly a material for books as parchment—prepared the way for the diffusion of the Scriptures.

The Church of Rome did not apprehend the danger that lay in that Book. Previous to the Reformation there were not only editions of the Scripture in the originals, but the old Church translation into Latin (the Vulgate,) and versions from it into the living languages were printed. In Spain, in that very land whose dark opposition to the Word of God has since become her reproach and her curse, and in which no such book as the one of which we are about to speak has come forth for centuries, in Spain, more than a hundred years before there was enough Hebrew type in all England to print three consecutive lines, the first great **POLYGLOT BIBLE**, in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latin, was issued at Complutum under the direction of Ximenes, her renowned cardinal and chief minister of State. It came forth in a form which, in splendor and value, far surpassed all that the world had yet seen. We may consider the Complutensian Polyglot, the crown of glory to the labors of the Middle Ages. It links itself clearly in historical connection with the **GRAND BIBLICAL ERA**, the Reformation itself, for though the printing of it was begun in 1502, and finished in 1517, it was not published till 1522, and in 1522 the **FIRST EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT**, in German, came from the hand of Luther, fixing the corner-stone of the grand edifice, whose foundation had been laid in the **Ninety-five Theses of 1517**.

This, then, is the historical result of the facts we have presented, that the Middle Ages became, in the wonderful providence of God, the conservators of the Word which

they are charged with suppressing; and were unconsciously tending toward the sun-rise of the truth, which was to melt away their mists forever.

Where the Bible Fell Open.

The earliest efforts of the press were directed to the multiplication of the copies of the Word of God. The first book ever printed, was the Bible. Before the first twelve sheets of this first edition of the Scriptures were printed, Guttenberg and Faust had incurred an expenditure of four thousand florins. That Bible was the edition of the Latin Vulgate, commonly known by the name of the "Mazarine Bible," from the fact that a copy of it which for some time was the only one known, was discovered about the middle of the eighteenth century in the Library of the College of the Four Nations, founded at Paris by Cardinal Mazarine. At Mentz and Cologne, the Vulgate translation of the Holy Scriptures was multiplied in editions of various sizes. Some of these Latin Bibles had been purchased for the University Library at Erfurth at a large price, and were rarely shown even to visitors. One of them was destined to play a memorable part in the history of mankind. While it was lying in the still niche of the Library, there moved about the streets of the city and through the halls of the University, a student of some eighteen years of age, destined for the law, who already gave evidence of a genius which might have been a snare to indolence, but who devoted himself to study with an unquenchable ardor. Among the dim recesses of the Library, he was a daily seeker for knowledge. His was a thirst for truth which was not satisfied with the prescribed routine. Those books of which we now speak as venerable antiques, were then young and fresh—the glow of novelty was on much of which we now speak as the musty and worm-eaten record of old-time wisdom which we have outgrown. There the city of Harlem, through Laurentius, and the city of Mentz, through Faustus, and the city of Strasburg, through Guttenberg, put in their silent claims for the glory of being the cradle of the magic art of printing. There the great masters in jurisprudence and in scholastic philosophy challenged, and not in vain, the attention of the young searcher for knowledge. Some of the most voluminous of the Jurisconsults he could recite almost word for word. Occam and Gerson were his

favorites among the scholastics. The masters of the classic world, Cicero, Virgil and Livy, "he read," says a Jesuit author, "not merely as a student whose aim was to understand them, but as a superior intellect, which sought to draw from them instruction, to find in them counsels and maxims for his after life. They were to him the flowers whose sweet odor might be shed upon the path he had to tread, or might calm the future agitation of his mind and of his heart." Thus passing from volume to volume, seeking the solution of the dark problem of human life, which already gathered heavily upon his deep earnest soul, he one day took down a ponderous volume hitherto unnoticed. He opens it; the title-page is "*Biblia Sacra*"—the Holy Bible. He is disappointed. He has heard all this, he thinks, in the lessons of the Missal, in the texts of the Postils, in the selections of the Breviary. He imagines that his mother, the Church, has incorporated the whole Book of God in her services. Listlessly he allows the volume to fall open at another place, in his hand, and carelessly looks down at the page. What is it that arouses him? His eye kindles with amazement and intense interest. He rests the Book on the pile of the works of Schoolmen and of Fathers which he has been gathering. He hangs entranced over it; his dreamy eyes are fixed on the page; hour after hour flies; the shades of night begin to gather, and he is forced to lay the volume aside, with the sigh, O, that this Book of books might one day be mine!

Was it accident, or was it of God, that this Book opened where it did? Could we have arranged the providence, where would we have had the book to open? It opened at the first chapter of I. Samuel, the simple story of Hannah consecrating her boy to the Lord. There are many parts of the Bible as precious as this; with reverence we speak it, there are some more precious, "for one star differeth from another star in glory," though God made them all. Why opened not that Book at some of the most glorious revelations of the New Testament? This might have been, and who shall say what incalculable loss it might have wrought to the world, had it been so? For this very portion might have been one of the Epistles, or Gospels, or lessons of the Romish service, and thus might have confirmed the false impression of the young man that he already knew all the Bible. This was a critical period of Luther's life. Already was his mind tending to an ab-

sorption in studies which would have given a wholly different cast to his life. The sound of a drum upon the street was the turning point of the spiritual life of an English nobleman. It lifted him from his knees, and drew him again into the full march upon everlasting death. On what little things may God have been pleased to hang the great impulses of the man, who proved himself capable of leading the Reformation, and who, but for these little things, might have been lost to the world. Nothing in God's hand is trifling. The portion on which Luther's eye fell was not in the Church Service. It quickened him at once with a new sense of the fulness of God's Word. In a double sense it stood before him, as a revelation. His eyes were opened on the altar of that inextinguishable fire, from which a few sparks had risen into the Romish Ritual, and had drifted along on the night breezes of the ages. Did the angel of the Covenant with invisible hand open that page, or was it a breath of air from some lattice near at hand? It matters not—God opened the Book.

That Book was to Luther henceforth, the thing of beauty of his life, the joy of his soul forever. He read and re-read, and prayed over its sacred teachings, till the place of each passage, and all memorable passages in their places fixed themselves in his memory. To the study of it, all other study seemed tame. A single passage of it would oftentimes lie in his thoughts days and nights together. The Bible seemed to fuse itself into his being, to become a part of his nature. Often in his writings he does not so much remark upon it, as catch its very pulse and clothe his own mind in its very garb. He is lifted to the glory of the re-producer—and himself becomes a secondary prophet and apostle. His soul ceased to be a mere vessel to hold a little of the living water, and became a fountain through which it sprang to refresh and gladden others. As with Luther so was it with Melancthon his noble co-worker, with Zwingle in Switzerland, at a later period with Calvin in France, with Tyndale and Cranmer in England, with Knox in Scotland. The Word of God was the fire in their souls which purified them into Christians—and the man who became a Christian was already unconsciously a Reformer.

Luther's Bible.

The fire which the Word of God kindled in the Re-

formers they could not long conceal. "They believed—therefore they spoke." One of the first, as it was one of the greatest, revelations of the revived power of the Word of God was, that it sought an audience for itself before the people, in their own language. Every new Pentecost revives the miracle and wonder of the first Pentecost: men marveling, say of the apostles to whom the Holy Ghost has again given utterance: "We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." Foremost in this imperishable work of the sixteenth century, was the man who was first and chief in more works, and in greater ones, than ever fell to any of our race, in the ordinary vocation of God. Great monuments has the sixteenth century left us of the majesty revealed by the human mind, when its noblest powers are disciplined by study, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. Great are the legacies of doctrinal, polemical, historical and confessional divinity which that century has left us. Immortal are its confessions, its devotional, practical, hymnological and liturgical labors. It was the century of Melancthon's *Loci* and of Calvin's *Institutes*, of the *Examen* of Chemnitz, and the *Catalogus Testium* of Flaccius, and of the *Magdeburg Centuries*. Its confessions are still the centres of great communions, its hymns are still sung by devout thousands, its forms still mould the spirit of worship among millions. But its grandest achievement was the giving of the Bible to the nations, and the centre and throne of this achievement is LUTHER'S TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE, the greatest single work ever accomplished by man in the department of theological literature. The Word of God, in whole or in part, has been translated into several hundred of the dialects of our race. Many of these translations, as for example the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and our own authorized version, have great historical significance; but in its historical connections and significance, Luther's is incomparably most important of all. Had it been his sole labor, the race could never forget his name.

Never were a greater need and the fittest agent to meet it, so brought together as in the production of this translation. One of the earliest convictions of Luther was, the people *must* have the Bible, and to this end it must be translated. It came from the press of Eggestejn, in Strasburg, (not as has been frequently maintained, from the

press of Faust and Schöffer, in 1462.) It is true, that beginning with the Gothic translation of Ulphilas, in the fourth century, there had been various translations of the Scriptures into the Germanic tongues. About 1466, appeared the first Bible, printed in German. Between the appearance of this Bible and that of Luther, there were issued in the dialect of Upper Germany some fourteen editions of the Word of God, beside several in the dialect of Lower Germany. These were, without exception, translations of a translation; they were made from the Vulgate, and, however they may have differed, they had a common character which may be expressed in a word—they were abominable. In a copy of one of them, in the library of the writer of this article, there is a picture of the Deluge, in which mermaids are floating around the ark, arranging their tresses with the aid of small looking glasses, with a most amphibious nonchalance. The rendering is about as true to the idea, as the picture is to nature. In the possession of Mr. Mickley, of Philadelphia, is another of these editions, remarkable for typographical errors, which represents Eve, not as a house-wife, but as a “kiss-wife,” and its typography is the best part of it. How Luther raised what seemed a barbarous jargon into a language, which, in flexible beauty, and power of internal combination, has no parallel but in the Greek, and in massive vigor no superior but the English, writers of every school, Protestant and Romish alike, have loved to tell. The language of Germany has grown since Luther, but it has had no new creation. He who takes up Luther’s Bible grasps a whole world in his hand—a world which will only perish, when this green earth itself shall pass away.

The Only Rule.

In all lands in which the battle of the Reformation was fought, the Bible furnished banner, armor, and arms. It was, indeed, more than ensign, more than shield, more than sword, for “the Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” The word of God opened the eyes of the Reformers to the existing corruptions; it called them forth from Babylon; it revealed to them the only source of heal-

ing for the sick and wounded Church ; it inspired them with ardor for their holy work ; it lifted them above the desire for man's favor, and the fear of man's face. The Bible made them confessors, and prepared them to be martyrs.

The Reformers knew where their strength lay. They felt that what had redeemed them could alone redeem the Church. They saw that, under God, their ability to sustain their cause depended on His Word. The supreme and absolute authority of God's Word in determining all questions of doctrine and of duty, is a fundamental principle of the Reformation—a principle so fundamental, that, without it, there would have been no Reformation—and so vital that a Reformation without it, could such a Reformation be supposed, would have been at best a glittering delusion and failure.

It is true, that there was testimony from human sources, which was not without value, in its right place, in the controversy with Rome. In a certain sense, her condemnation had already been anticipated by her own lips. In the long-gone days of her purity, the Church of Rome had men of God, who held to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Thirty years after our Lord's ascension, St. Paul wrote to the Church of Rome, "I am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another. Your obedience is come abroad unto all men." This glorious condition did not pass away speedily. There were generations following, in which the truth was kept comparatively pure. Papal Rome could no more stand before the judgment of the early writers in the Church of Rome yet undefiled than she could before the Scriptures. Hence, the confessors declared* that, in their doctrine, there not only was nothing in conflict with the Holy Scriptures, and with the true Church Catholic, or Church Universal, but nothing in conflict with the teachings of the true Church of Rome, as her doctrines were set forth by the writers of the earlier ages. The quotations made from these fathers, in the Confession, best illustrate the meaning of this declaration, and prove its truth. Thus, for example, they quote the Nicene Fathers, as witnesses to the doctrine of the Trinity ; Ambrose is cited to show, "that he that believeth in Christ, is saved, without

* Augs. Confess. 471.

works, by faith alone, freely receiving remission." In the articles on Abuses, the artillery of the purer fathers and councils is turned upon the enemy with tremendous effect, while they fly from the covert of Holy Scripture, in which they had made an effort to intrench themselves.

But not because of the testimony of the Church and of its writers did the Reformers hold the truth they confessed. They knew that individual churches could err, and had erred grievously, that the noblest men were fallible. Nothing but the firm word of God sufficed for them.

They thanked God, indeed, for the long line of witnesses for the truth of His Word. Within the Church of Rome, in the darkest ages, there had been men faithful to the truth. There were men, in the midst of the dominant corruption, who spake and labored against it. There were Protestants, ages before our princes made their protest at Spires, and Lutherans, before Luther was born. But not on these, though they sealed the truth with their own blood, did the Reformers lean. They joyfully used them as testimony, but not as authority. They placed them in the box of the witness, not on the bench of the judge. Their utterances, writings, and acts were not to be the rule of faith, but were themselves to be weighed in its balance. In God was their trust, and His Word alone was their stay.

When the great princes and free cities of our Church at Augsburg, in 1530, laid their Confession before the Emperor and potentates, civil and ecclesiastical, of the realm, they said: "We offer the Confession of the faith held by the pastors and preachers in our several estates, and the Confession of our own faith, *as drawn from the Holy Scriptures, the pure Word of God.*"* That Confession repeatedly expresses, and in every line implies that the Word of God is the sole rule of faith and of life. The same is true of the Apology or Defence of the Confession by Melancthon, which appeared in the following year, and which was adopted by the larger part of our Church as expressing correctly her views.† Seven years later, the articles of Smalcald were prepared by Luther, for presentation at a general council, as an expression of the views of our Church. In this he says:‡ "Not from the works or words of the fathers are articles of faith to be made. We have

* Ab. Præfat. 8.

† Apol. Con. 284 : 60.

‡ 303 : 15.

another rule, to wit: that God's Word shall determine articles of faith—and, beside it, none other—no, not an angel even."

Half a century after the Augsburg Confession had gone forth on its sanctifying mission, our Church in Germany, in order that her children might not mistake her voice amid the bewildering conflicts of theological strife, which necessarily followed such a breaking up of the old modes of human thought, as was brought about by the Reformation, set forth her latest and amplest Confession. This Confession with reference to the harmony it was designed to subserve, and under God did largely subserve, was called the Formula of Concord. That document opens with these words: "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and law, by which all teachings and all teachers are to be estimated and judged, *is none other whatsoever*, than the writings of the prophets and the apostles, alike of the Old and of the New Testament, as it is written: 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path;' and St. Paul saith, (Gal. 1:8:) 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.'"

"All other writings," it continues, "whether of the fathers, or of recent authors, be their name what they may, are by no means whatsoever to be likened to Holy Scripture; but are, in such sense, to be subjected to it, as to be received in none other way, than as witnesses, which show how and where, after the apostles' times, the doctrine of the apostles and prophets were preserved." "We embrace," says our confessors, "the Augsburg Confession, not because it was written by our theologians, but because it was taken from God's Word, and solidly built on the foundation of Holy Scripture."

With equal clearness do the other Churches of the Reformation express themselves on this point.

If, then, the Reformers knew the movements of their own minds, it was God's Word, and it alone, which made them confessors of the truth. And it is a fundamental principle of the Reformation, that God's Word is the sole and absolute authority, and rule of faith, and of life, a principle without accepting which, no man can be truly Evangelical, Protestant, or Lutheran.

The Providence of God and His Word, working together in the Reformation.

Fire not only makes bright and burning the thing it kindles, but gives to it the power of impartation; whatever is kindled, kindles again. From the Reformers, the fire spread to the people; and from cold and darkness the nations seemed to struggle upward, as by a common touch from heaven, in flames of holy sacrifice; and here, too, **THE WORD** showed its divine power.

We acknowledge, indeed, with joyous hearts, that God had prepared all things wonderfully, for the spread of the flame of the truth. In GERMANY, the fire was to burst forth, which was to spread to the ends of the earth. "In no event in the history of mankind does the movement of Divine Providence present itself more unmistakably, than in the Reformation in Germany."* The time, the place, the circumstances, the condition of the religious and of the political world, were in wonderful unison. They worked with each other, compensating each other's weaknesses, and helping each other's power, so as to give a sure foundation, a firm hold, a healthy direction, a high purity, a mighty protection, a wide-spread recognition, a swift and joyous progress, an abiding issue to the glorious work. The soul of the best men of the time was alive to the wretched condition, into which the Church had fallen. A profound longing for the Reformation filled the hearts of nations; science, literature, art, discovery, and invention were elevating Europe, and preparing the way for the triumphal march of pure religion, the queen of all knowledge. In the Papal chair sat Leo X., a lover of art and literature, careless and indolent in all things else. Over the beautiful plains of Germany, wandered Tetzels, senseless and impudent, even beyond the class to which he belonged, exciting the disgust of all thinking men, by the profligate manner in which he sold indulgences. To protect the trembling flame of the truth from the fierce winds, which, at first, would have extinguished it; to protect it till the tornado itself should only make it blaze more vehemently, God had prepared Frederick, the Wise, a man of immense influence, universally revered, and not more revered than his earnest piety, his fidelity, his eminent conscientiousness deserved. The Emperor Charles V., with power enough to quench the flame with a word, with a hatred to it which seemed to make it certain that he would speak that word,

* Dr. H. Kurtz, K. G. §211.

was yet so fettered by the plans of his ambition, that he left it unsaid, and thus was made the involuntary protector of that which he hated. These and a thousand other circumstances were propitious.

But in vain is the wood gathered, and in vain do the winds breathe, unless the fire is applied. In vain would Luther, with his incomparable gifts, have arisen—in vain would that genius, to which a Catholic writer declares Luther's own friends have not done full justice—in vain would that high courage, that stern resolve have presented themselves in the matchless combination in which they existed in him, had there not been first a power beyond that of man to purify him, and from him to extend itself in flame around him. With all of Luther's gifts, he might have been a monster of wickedness, or a slave of the dominant superstition, helping to strengthen its chains, and forge new ones, had not the truth of God made him free, had not the Spirit of God in His Word made him an humble and earnest believer. Luther was first a Christian, and then a Reformer, and he became a Reformer because he was a Christian. "He believed, therefore he spoke." But Christian as he was, he could not have been a successful Reformer, had he not possessed the power of spreading the fire of Divine truth. The fatal defect in all the Reformatory movements in the councils and universities of Paris in the fifteenth century, was that they were not based upon the true foundation, and did not propose to attain the great end by the right means. The cry had been for a Reform "in the head and members" by outward improvement, not in the Spirit and through the Word. The Reformation was kindled by the Word; it trusted the Word, and scattered it everywhere, directing attention to it in every writing, and grounding every position upon it. That Word soon made itself felt throughout all Europe. Even in the lands most thoroughly under Papal power, sparkles of the truth began to show themselves, as in Austria, Spain, and Italy. But from Wittenberg through Germany, from Zurich, through Switzerland, the first flame spread, and but a few years passed, ere all Europe, which is at this hour Protestant, had received the pure faith of the Word of God.

The fire of the Divine Word destroyed the accumulated stubble of tradition, swept away the hay, wood, and rubbish, which the hand of man had gathered on the foundation and heaped over the temple, and the gold, silver and

precious stones of the true house of God appeared. The Bible, like sunshine bursting through clouds, poured its light upon the nations. The teaching of mere men ceased to be regarded, and the prophecy was again fulfilled: "They shall all be taught of God."

A Lesson for Our Time.

Three hundred and fifty-one years ago, the first thrill of the earthquake of the Reformation was felt in Europe. Men knew so little of its nature, that they imagined it could be suppressed. They threw their weight upon the heaving earth, and hoped to make it lie still. They knew not that they had a power to deal with, which was made more terrible in its outburst by the attempt to confine it. As the result of the opposition to the Reformation, Europe was made desolate. After the final struggle of the Thirty Years' War, Europe seemed ruined, its fields had been drenched with blood, its cities laid in ashes, hardly a family remained undivided, and the fiercest passions had been so aroused, that it seemed as if they could never be allayed.

Yet the establishment of the work of the Reformation has richly repaid Europe for all she endured. The earthquake has gone, the streams of desolation have been chilled, and the nations make a jubilee over the glorious anniversary of that grand movement which, by the depravity of men, was made the occasion of so much disturbance and misery. The evils, of which the Reformation was the occasion, have passed away. We must go to the page of history to know what they were. The blessings of which the Reformation was the cause, abide; we feel them in our homes, in the Church, in the State; they are inwoven with the life of our life. Once feeling them, we know that this would be no world to live in without them.

And how instructive is this to us in the struggle of our day for the perpetuation of the truth restored by the Reformation. Not alone by Rome, but also by heretical or fanatical Pseudo-Protestants, is it still assailed—and when we see the guilty passions, the violence and odious spirit of misrepresentation excited, and feel them directed upon ourselves, we may be tempted to give up the struggle. But we are untrue to the lessons of the Reformation, if we thus yield.

Men tremble and weep as the molten and seething ele-

ments make the earth quake, and pour themselves out in red and wasting streams. But their outbursting is essential to their consolidation, and to their bearing part in the work of the world. What was once lava, marking its track in ruin, shall one day lie below fair fields, whose richness it has made. The olive shall stay the vine, and the shadows of the foliage of vine and olive shall ripple over flowers; and women and children, lovelier than the fruits and the flowers shall laugh and sing amid them. The blessings from the upheaving of the heart of the world shall gladden the children of those who gazed on it with wo-begone eyes. Had a war of three hundred years been necessary to sustain the Reformation, we now know the Reformation would ultimately have repaid all the sacrifices it demanded. Had our fathers surrendered the truth, even under that pressure to which ours is but a feather, how would we have cursed their memory, as we contrasted what we were, with what we might have been.

And shall we despond, draw back, and give our names to the reproach of generations to come, because the burden of the hour seems to us heavy? God, in His mercy, forbid! If all others are ready to yield to despondency, and abandon the struggle, we, children of the Reformation, dare not. That struggle has taught two lessons, which must never be forgotten. One is, that the true and the good must be secured at any price. They are beyond all price. We dare not compute their cost. They are the soul of our being, and the whole world is as dust in the balance against them. No matter what is to be paid for them, we must not hesitate to lay down their redemption price.

The other grand lesson is, that their price is never paid in vain. What we give can never be lost, *unless we give too little*. If we give all, we shall have all. All shall come back. Our purses shall be in the mouths of our sacks. We shall have both the corn and the money. But if we are niggard, we lose all—lose what we meant to buy, lose what we have given.

If we maintain the pure Word inflexibly at every cost, over against the arrogance of Rome and of the weak pretentiousness of Rationalism, we shall conquer both through the Word, but to compromise on a single point, is to lose all, and to be lost.

ARTICLE IX.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.*

Among the Churches of the Reformation, the Lutheran Church† occupies an important position. On the continent of Europe, numerically it far exceeds all other Protestant communions. In this Western World, also, it has a history. Although from the beginning it has encountered formidable obstacles, and, at every step in its progress, has been surrounded by numerous difficulties, it has triumphed over them all, and prospered. It has enjoyed tokens of the Divine favor, whilst it has labored for the advancement of that kingdom, which the Great Author of Christianity has established for the general good of mankind.

The first settlement of Lutherans in the United States, of which we have any account, was made by emigrants from Holland, who here sought a home and a place to worship God, soon after the establishment of the Dutch in the province of New Amsterdam, or New York, in 1621, during the period that Holland had possession of the colonies planted at the mouth of the Hudson. These emigrants,

* The substance of this brief sketch appeared, some years ago, in a *New England periodical*. It was, also, printed and circulated, as a *Tract*, by the Lutheran Board of Publication. The material has since been revised and enlarged, and the statistics brought down to the present time. It is by request published in this form, as convenient for reference.

† The population of the world is estimated at thirteen hundred millions of souls. Three hundred and thirty-five millions of these are nominally Christians. These are again divided into one hundred and seventy millions Roman Catholic, eighty millions Protestants, and seventy-six millions Greek Catholics.

LUTHERANS IN THE WORLD.

Of the eighty millions of Protestants in the world, *more than one half are Lutherans*. They are distributed very nearly as follows:

for a long time, assembled in private houses for prayer and the reading of the Scriptures by one of their own number, a layman, appointed for the purpose of conducting their social devotions. In the course of time, they had very much increased by accessions from Germany and France. The first Lutheran minister whose services they enjoyed, was John Earnest Goetwater, sent, in 1657, by the Lutheran Consistory in Holland, to labor for the spiritual interests of their suffering brethren in New Amsterdam, and, no doubt, designed to missionate among the scattered Lutherans in other parts of the colony. He remained, however, only a few months, in consequence of the religious intolerance and persecution in the administration of the civil government. Jacob Fabritius, so often referred to, did not reach this country till 1669. The first church edifice was erected in 1671.

A colony of Swedish Lutherans arrived in 1638, and settled on the banks of the Delaware. The settlement was contemplated during the reign of Gustavus Adolphus, an illustrious hero of our faith, but his benevolent wish was not executed until after his death. The long-cherished plan of an American colony, claimed the early attention of his prime minister, Oxenstiern, one of the ablest and purest men that ever governed a kingdom. The controlling thought in his enterprise was the establishment of the

Sweden,.....	3,100,000
Norway,.....	1,600,000
Denmark, the Faroe Islands, Jutland, and Greenland.....	2,000,000
France,.....	500,500
Protestant Germany,.....	25,000,000
Prussia,.....	8,000,000
Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia.....	2,000,000
Poland and Russia,.....	3,000,000
Holland,.....	600,000
Italy and Turkey in Europe,.....	16,000
England,.....	40,000
New South Wales.....	3,000
United States of America,.....	1,000,000
West India Islands,.....	100,000
Nova Scotia and Canada,.....	6,000
South America,.....	150,000
Total,.....	47,115,500

These statistics have been compiled from different sources, but principally from the tabular statements, furnished by C. F. Deitterich, of Berlin, *Director of the Statistical Department*.

Christian religion in this country. In the royal instructions received from Sweden, the language used is: "Before all, the governor must labor and watch, that he render, in all things, to Almighty God, the true worship which is his due, the glory, the praise and the homage that belong to Him, and take good measures that the Divine service is performed according to the true Confession of Augsburg, the Council of Upsal and the ceremonies of the Swedish Church, having care that all men, and especially the youth, be instructed in all the parts of Christianity, and that a good ecclesiastical discipline be observed and maintained." Reorus Torkillus accompanied the colony as its preacher, and officiated in this capacity, till death terminated his labors. In 1642, they were favored with the services of John Campanius, the diligent spiritual guide of the colony, who labored as the first Protestant missionary among the Indians of this country, and was so well known for his enlightened zeal and earnest efforts for their spiritual welfare. His translation of Luther's Catechism into their language, affords a proof of his devotion to their interests and his success.

The next settlement of Lutherans in this country was that of the Germans. Towards the close of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, immigrations into the provinces of New York and Pennsylvania were frequent and numerous. These settlements subsequently extended to Maryland and Virginia. About the year 1710, four thousand Germans, principally Lutherans, the victims of civil oppression and religious persecution, fled for refuge to England, and, under the patronage of Queen Anne, settled in the provinces of New York and South Carolina. In New York, a large tract of land was appropriated to this object, and the patent distinctly states, that it was for the maintenance of Lutheran parish schools and ministers from Germany, locating in the vicinity of the Hudson. In 1717, the immigration into Pennsylvania was so great as to excite the serious apprehension of the civil authorities. The Colonial Records tell us, that the Governor of the province felt it his duty to direct the attention of the "Provincial Council" to the fact, "that large numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and Constitution, had lately been imported into the province." They continued to come from the Palatinate, Wurtemberg, Darmstadt, and other parts of Germany.

Although deprived of the regular ministrations of the sanctuary, large portions of them, who were under the influence of religious principles, remained true to the faith, in which they had been reared. They had brought with them from their native land their hymn books, catechisms, and manuals of devotion, which they faithfully read, endeavoring to keep alive in their hearts the spirit of piety, and anticipating a more propitious season, when the means of grace would be adequately provided. In the meantime, the Swedish ministers rendered occasional services in preaching the Word and administering the sacraments, whenever their duties to their own churches did not interfere. From the very commencement, the most friendly feeling and the most cordial relations existed between the Swedes and the Germans.

In 1734, a colony of Lutherans settled in Georgia. They came as refugees from Salzburg, then a district of Bavaria, but, since 1814, a part of the Austrian dominions. Suffering from civil oppression and Romish intolerance at home, in consequence of their unwavering attachment to the Gospel, they sought an asylum in this country, where they might, without fear and molestation, worship the God whom they loved, and with whom they had entered into solemn covenant. They were kindly welcomed to their new home by General Ogelthorpe, and the spot selected for their settlement they named Ebenezer, and resolved to raise a column of stone, in token of gratitude to God, whose marked interposition had conducted them safely to these shores, where they enjoyed freedom to worship God, and where a kind Providence had delivered them from the power of their enemies. These exiles were highly favored in being furnished with most excellent and faithful pastors in John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau, who shared with them all the vicissitudes, the trials, and difficulties, incident to their position.

The arrival, in 1742, of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, generally and justly recognized as the Patriarch and Founder of the Lutheran Church in America, marks a new era in our history. From this period, the character of our Church gradually improved; its position was strengthened, and permanence given to its efforts. Under his ministrations the Church assumed organic form. Dr. Muhlenberg, by nature and education, was eminently fitted for the mission which he had undertaken. He possessed piety, learn-

ing, experience, skill, industry, and perseverance. He was deeply interested in the work to, which he had devoted himself. He burned with an earnest desire to relieve the spiritual destitution that prevailed, to gather together the lost sheep, and to preach to them the truths of the Gospel. He immediately took charge of the congregations in Philadelphia, at Providence, and New Hanover, which had united in the call for a minister, and for a season labored not only alone here, but also exercised a paternal supervision over the whole Church in this country. His duties were arduous, but they were discharged with cheerfulness and unwearied fidelity, and amid perils and difficulties, trials and exposures, at the present day, scarcely credible. Some idea of the wants of our Lutheran population, at this time, may be formed from the following representations, given by Dr. Muhlenberg, in his correspondence with his friends at Halle: "Here are thousands who, by birth, education, and confirmation, ought to belong to our Church, but they are scattered to the four winds of heaven. The spiritual state of our people is so wretched as to cause us to shed copious tears. The young people have grown up without any knowledge of religion, and are fast running into heathenism. If affairs had remained a few years longer in the same state in which I found them, our poor Lutherans would have been irretrievably lost. There are found here almost innumerable systems, opinions, and temptations. Atheists, Deists, and Materialists surround you on every side. It seems to me, there is not a sect in the world which is not fostered. You meet with persons from almost every nation in the world. What would not be tolerated in Europe, finds full license here. God and his Word are openly blasphemed, his ordinances neglected, and his worship despised."

An increase of laborers was demanded. Earnest appeals to the brethren in Germany were often renewed, and the cry for help importunately raised. Muhlenberg's influence with his transatlantic friends induced others to embark in the work, and to unite with him in his labors of love. In 1745, Brunnholtz arrived, accompanied by Kurtz and Schaum, as catechists, to aid the pastors and instruct the young. It was a part of our earlier system always to connect the teacher with the minister, to plant a school wherever there was a church. It was regarded as an essential element in our organization to educate the child-

ren of the Church in the principles of the Christian religion, as well as to furnish them with secular instruction. The Catechism of Luther was studied in all the churches. The pastor visited the congregational schools and the families of the people, and sought by means of the Catechism to present the doctrines of the Gospel in a plain, simple, attractive form. Care was taken not to overtask the memory, yet every doctrine was to be proved and established by some apt quotation from Scripture. It was made the duty of the parent and the pastor to see that whatever was committed to memory was thoroughly understood, so that not only the memory, but the affections of the soul might be occupied with the good Word of God.

The call for ministerial services became from year to year still louder and more general. Other congregations were organized, and faithful pastors, to instruct them in the way of life and minister the sacraments, were earnestly sought. In response to repeated applications for aid, reinforcements to the field were, at different periods, sent from the Orphan House at Halle. In 1748, Handschuh came; in 1751, Heintzelman and Shulze; in 1764, Voigt and Krug; in 1765, Schultze; in 1769, Helmuth and Schmidt; in 1770, Kunze, and about the same time, the three sons of Dr. Muhlenberg, who had gone to Europe to prosecute their studies, returned, and entered upon the active duties of the ministry. During the earlier period in our history, from other points also came Berkenmeyer, Sommer, Stoecker, Hartwig, Ritz, Bager, Raus, Weygand, Geroock, Driesler, Nussman, Storch, and others deserving our gratitude and veneration, imbued with the missionary spirit, and devoted to the interests of the truth, influenced by a desire to build up the waste places of Zion in this missionary field, and to extend the interests of Christ's kingdom. Much has been said, and properly, too, in praise of the "Pilgrim Fathers," who abandoned the endearments and comforts of their native land, on account of their attachment to the truth and love of souls; yet, in genuine piety, Christian heroism, and energetic devotion to the cause of the Redeemer, the men who planted the Lutheran Church in this Western Hemisphere will not suffer in comparison with them. Their history presents a most beautiful example of patient endurance and untiring zeal in the service of God. Their indefatigable and self-denying efforts, their earnest and faithful life, illustrating the doctrines of

the Church they loved, and for whose advancement they were toiling, made a deep impression upon their contemporaries, and secured the confidence and sympathy of all, with whom they were brought in contact. The prevalence of the German language among them, and the preservation of their records in their native tongue, have deprived them of the position in the early history of our country, to which their acknowledged literary character, their virtues, and their influence, justly give them a claim.

In 1748, at the suggestion of the Theological Faculty at Halle, the first Lutheran Synod in this country was organized, for the purpose of promoting a harmonious co-operation of all parts of the Church, and of imparting greater efficiency to the efforts of the ministry. The Convention was held on the 14th of August, in Philadelphia, and there were in attendance six ministers, viz.: Muhlenberg, Brunnholtz, Handschuh, Hartwig, Sandin, and Næsmann; the last two were of the Swedish Lutheran Church. They, however, participated in the deliberations of the Convention, and assisted in the examination and ordination of candidate John Nicolas Kurtz, who was the first Lutheran minister regularly set apart in this country to the work of the ministry. Pastor Hartwig, on the occasion, preached the ordination sermon from the words, "*His blood will I require at thy hand.*" At this period in our history, there were altogether only eleven ordained Lutheran ministers and forty organized congregations, whilst the Lutheran population was estimated at sixty thousand, dispersed over a large extent of territory.

The Synodical meetings continued to be held annually, and were attended with the most beneficial results. They not only advanced the prosperity of the Church, but the hands of the brethren were strengthened, and their hearts encouraged. They promoted kind feeling, and formed a bond of union among the churches. These meetings were also frequently blessed to the awakening and edification of the congregations, in whose midst the conventions were held. In 1768, the ministry embraced twenty-four members, the youngest, at that time, being J. Daniel Kurtz, D. D., who in 1856, in the 93d year of his age, was called from the toils of earth to the rewards of heaven.

In 1765, Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt commenced a private seminary for the instruction of candidates for the sacred office, the supplies from Germany being inadequate

to meet the wants of the Church. This institution was in successful operation twenty years, and educated many of our earlier and more influential ministers. In 1787, the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College, for the special benefit of the Germans of the Commonwealth, as an acknowledgement of services by them rendered to the State, and in consideration, of "their industry, economy, and public virtues." Henry Ernest Muhlenberg, D. D., at the time pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, was chosen as the first President of this institution. In 1791, influenced by a feeling of gratitude, the Legislature also made an appropriation of five thousand acres of land to the free schools of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia, in which, at that time, eighty indigent children were receiving gratuitous instruction. The prospects of our Church were now most promising. It was increasing in numbers, efficiency, and influence. It possessed the confidence, regard, and sympathy of all Christian denominations. Our ministers everywhere challenged respect, and enjoyed a large share of public favor.

Unfortunately, however, the contest, which arose in reference to the introduction of the English language into the exercises of public worship, arrested our progress, and, for a season, dimmed our horizon. It proved an occasion of discord and alienation, resulted in serious injury to the Church, and almost caused its total ruin. It was natural that the Germans should be reluctant to give up the language, to which they had been accustomed from infancy, and which they sincerely thought would be perpetuated in this land of their adoption. But it was a mistaken policy. This resolute adherence to the exclusive use of their vernacular tongue was the great obstacle to our success as a Church. Thousands abandoned their parental communion and sought a home among other denominations, because their children did not understand the German, whilst many who remained, because of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the services, and became careless in their attendance on the ministrations of the sanctuary. If the noble example of Dr. Muhlenberg had been followed, and the judicious counsels of Dr. Kunze prevailed, it would have been well for us. The Church, at the present, would exhibit a very different aspect.

For nearly forty years the Synod of Pennsylvania was the only ecclesiastical body in our connection. In 1785,

the New York Ministerium was organized, with fourteen ministers and eighteen congregations. In the year 1809, the first exclusively English Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, and, perhaps, in the whole country, was established by Dr. Mayer, who ministered to the same congregation for upwards of half a century, and, in the spring of 1858, in the seventy-eighth year of his age, passed away, and "like as a shock of corn cometh in his season," fully ripe, was gathered into the heavenly garner. The Synod of North Carolina was formed in 1803; the Synod of Ohio in 1819; the Synod of Maryland and Virginia in 1820; the Synod of West Pennsylvania, in 1825. From that period until the present, Synods have multiplied, so that the number now amounts to fifty-two, spread over eighteen different States of the Union, and Canada. The Theological Seminary at Hartwick, New York, established, in virtue of a legacy of a large tract of land, in Otsego County, by J. C. Hartwig, went into operation in 1816, and has been steadily engaged in training young men for the holy office of the ministry.

As the Church began to diffuse itself over a more extended territory, and the number of District Synods was increased, the propriety of forming some central bond of union was often discussed. The conviction, from year to year, deepened among those who were interested in the prosperity of the Church, that a step of this kind was necessary, in order that injudicious divisions might not arise, and that more general uniformity in the usages and practices of the Church might prevail. Our best men felt that the occasional intercourse of the District Synods, through their representatives, assembled in general convention, would secure to the Church great advantages, and impart increased strength and more efficient action to all those enterprises, in which concentration is so essential to success. This was the origin of the General Synod, which forms a new epoch in our history, and has been a great blessing to the Church. It brought into existence, and has sustained many of those noble institutions among us which have been so happy in their effects, and which are the glory of our Church. In 1820, at the time of the organization of the General Synod, there were one hundred and three ministers connected with the Church. Of late years, the increase in our ministry has been very great.

In 1823, there were 175 ministers and 900 congregations; in 1833, 337 ministers and 1,017 congregations; in 1843, 430 ministers and 1,371 congregations; in 1853, 900 ministers and 1,750 congregations; in 1863, 1,365 ministers, and 2,487 congregations; and in 1868 1,889 ministers, and 3,326 congregations.*

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN NORTH AMERICA.

In the General Synod of the United States.

Synods.	Ministers.	Churches.	Communicants.
1. Synod of New York,.....	19.....	12.....	1,642
2. Hartwick Synod, (N. Y.),.....	28.....	31.....	4,109
3. Franckean Synod, (N. Y.),.....	23.....	29.....	2,479
4. Synod of New Jersey,.....	8.....	13.....	1,697
5. Synod of East Pennsylvania,.....	52.....	103.....	9,828
6. Susquehanna Synod, (Penn.),.....	26.....	48.....	4,900
7. Synod of West Pennsylvania,.....	50.....	101.....	14,092
8. Synod of Central Pennsylvania,.....	38.....	61.....	4,825
9. Alleghany Synod, (Penn.),.....	45.....	98.....	6,734
10. Pittsburg Synod, (Penn.),.....	17.....	50.....	2,800
11. Synod of Maryland,.....	35.....	43.....	8,347
12. Melancthon Synod, (Md.),.....	18.....	37.....	3,755
13. East Ohio Synod,.....	38.....	68.....	3,838
14. Wittenberg Synod, (Ohio),.....	32.....	47.....	3,678
15. Miami Synod, (Ohio),.....	34.....	40.....	3,405
16. Synod of Northern Indiana,.....	30.....	71.....	3,415
17. Olive Branch Synod, (Ind.),.....	17.....	27.....	1,576
18. Synod of Northern Illinois,.....	30.....	48.....	2,105
19. Synod of Southern Illinois,.....	19.....	16.....	817
20. Synod of Central Illinois,.....	19.....	24.....	1,410
21. Synod of Iowa,.....	22.....	29.....	1,171
22. Synod of Kansas,.....	10.....	12.....	500
	610	1,008	87,123

In the General Council.

1. Ministerium of New York, etc.,.....	50.....	50.....	13,000
2. Ministerium of Pennsylvania, etc.,... 137.....	305.....		51,800
3. Pittsburg Synod,.....	58.....	103.....	8,605
4. English Dis't Synod of Ohio, etc.,... 38.....	90.....		10,000
5. English Synod of Ohio;.....	12.....	26.....	2,280
6. Synod of Illinois, etc.,.....	35.....	48.....	4,746
7. Scandinavian Augustana Synod,.....	48.....	96.....	13,203
8. Synod of Michigan, etc.,.....	15.....	27.....	3,300
9. Synod of Wisconsin, etc.,.....	52.....	103.....	15,200
10. German Synod of Iowa,.....	60.....	105.....	8,000
11. Synod of Minnesota, etc.,.....	26.....	60.....	3,742
12. Synod of Texas,.....	20.....	28.....	2,920
13. Synod of Canada,.....	24.....	60.....	7,920
	575	1,101	144,716

The influence of the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, established at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in 1825, and of Pennsylvania College, in 1832, has been most salutary—the fruitful source of much good to the Church. At these Institutions hundreds have been prepared for the Christian ministry, who are scattered through the land, occupying honorable positions, making an impression upon society, and exerting a powerful influence upon the Church. From these fountains of learning and piety, have sprung into existence most of our other literary and theological schools, which, in different parts of our Zion, are laboring so faithfully and successfully for the advancement of her welfare.

Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, was founded 1845; Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, in 1850; Illi-

In the Southern General Synod.

1. Synod of Virginia.....	30.....	61.....	3,200
2. Synod of South-West Virginia,.....	21.....	40.....	2,179
3. Synod of North Carolina,.....	18.....	34.....	3,716
4. Synod of South Carolina,.....	33.....	44.....	4,817
5. Synod of Georgia,.....	6.....	10.....	1,200
6. Holston Synod, (Tenn.).....	12.....	25.....	2,000
	<u>120</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>17,112</u>

Synods not in any General Synod, or General Council.

1. German Synod of New York, etc.,... 10.....	11.....	1,800
2. Buffalo Synod of New York,..... 15.....	22.....	1,850
3. Joint Synod of Ohio,..... 109.....	227.....	30,500
4. Joint Synod of Missouri,..... 315.....	347.....	48,814
5. Norwegian Synod of Wisconsin, etc... 50.....	220.....	31,480
6. Union Synod of Indiana,..... 17.....	17.....	2,110
7. Eilson's Synod of the West,..... 9.....	25.....	2,000
8. Missionary Synod of the West,..... 11.....	20.....	700
9. Tennessee Synod,..... 30.....	82.....	7,000
10. Concordia Synod of Virginia,..... 9.....	15.....	1,000
11. Synod of Mississippi,..... 7.....	11.....	2,000
	<u>582</u>	<u>997</u>
		<u>129,254</u>

Grand Total—52 Synods; 1,887 Ministers; 3,320 Churches; 378,205 Communicants.

These statistics have been principally gathered from official documents, most recently published. When these could not be secured, those last printed, in the possession of the writer, have been used, or else information, directly received from individuals supposed to be fully acquainted with the facts.

nois State University, Springfield, Ill., in 1853; Roanoke College, Salem, Va., in 1854; Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.,* in 1858; North Carolina College, Mt. Pleasant, N. C., in 1859; Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., in 1867. The Missionary Institute, Selinsgrove, Pa., was established in 1859, and the Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, in 1864. In 1867 was formed the "General Council," representing various Lutheran Synods in the United States and Canada, on the basis of the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books. At the present time there are connected with the Council 13 Synods, 1,101 churches, and 144,716 communicants.

The last year witnessed the whole Lutheran Church in this country, of all parties and shades of opinion, engaged with great unanimity, with enthusiastic interest and deep solemnity, in celebrating the *Seventh Jubilee of the Reformation*. It commemorated this interesting and important event *with appropriate services*, as an acknowledgment to Almighty God for his great goodness, and *with special efforts* for the preservation and perpetuation of the inestimable advantages we enjoy, restored to the Church, through the blessed Reformation. Three hundred and fifty years have passed, since Martin Luther affixed to the church gates his famous *Theses*, from which act we have derived religious freedom, and an open Bible; the doctrine of Justification by Faith has been revealed as the true and unfailing fountain for the remission of sin, and restoration to the favor of God. The principles, which the Founder of our Church defended with his efforts and illustrated in his life, still live. *The workman dies, but the work goes on.*

In reviewing the past as a Church, we have reason to bless God for what has been accomplished, to feel grateful for the Divine blessing which has hitherto accompanied us, to take courage and go forth with renewed strength, greater faith, and more earnest effort in the discharge of our mission. The Lutheran Church in this country, has a position, of which we need not be ashamed. It has a reputation high and extended; it has a ministry which Christians of any denomination might be proud to recognize as their own—men of piety and learning, of noble spirit and earnest character, men "fearing God and work-

* This Institution has recently been removed to Walahala, S. C.

ing righteousness"—whose influence upon the community and the Church is everywhere felt; it has numerous Theological and Literary Schools, Colleges, Academies and Female Seminaries, its Orphans' Homes and Eleemosynary Institutions, scattered over different parts of the land; it has its Publication Boards, its Quarterly, its Monthly and Weekly Periodicals, regularly disseminating truth all over the Church, sending forth streams of knowledge to instruct and edify our people, to "make glad the city of God;" it is laboring with zeal and success in the cause of Foreign and Domestic Missions; it contributes liberally to the education of the pious poor in their preparation for the ministry of reconciliation, and, in an enlightened and catholic spirit, aids in all the great benevolent enterprises of the day.

"Hitherto hath the Lord helped us," and we have reason in the future to expect his promised assistance and continued blessing. There is much to cheer and urge us forward. If we are true to ourselves, and faithful to the mission assigned us by Providence, the sanguine expectation may be cherished, that the day will come, when the whole Lutheran Church in this country will appear in one united phalanx, and engage, with increased efficiency, in combined efforts, to advance the interests of our Zion, and to diffuse the pure principles of the Gospel to the ends of the earth!

ARTICLE X.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE SABBATH, AND THE
LORD'S DAY.*

By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Phillipsburg, Pa.

In the investigation of theological truth, we must be especially careful of two things: *first*, that we do not come to the study of the Scriptures with pre-conceived opinions, into whose mould we force the language of the Word of

*A Thesis read before the Pittsburgh Synod, at Erie, Pa., October 1st, 1868, and published by request of said body.

God; and, *secondly*, that after having come to a decision, whether right or wrong, as to the meaning of Divine Revelation on a certain point, we do not read this our impression of God's truth into the teachings of the Church. The argument that the Church teaches thus and thus, because the Word of God teaches so, is as fallacious as Rome's inversion of the argument that the Word of God teaches so because the Church has thus explained it, inasmuch as the teachings of the Church are in this manner accepted as *necessarily* and *invariably* derived from the Word. Of course, so far as the Church corresponds to her definition, as the assembly in which the gospel is preached in its purity, this requirement is fulfilled; but as with the pure doctrine, there is frequently an admixture of human error, we must compare all the doctrines of the Church with those of the Word, in order to determine what may be true and what may be false, what pure and what impure, what may be God's truth and what human error. We have no more right to interpret the language of our Confessions, by what we conceive to be the word of God, or by what actually is the word of God, than we have to interpret this Word by our Confessions. Divine Revelation and summaries of human conceptions of this Revelation, are entirely distinct works, and are to be studied independently of one another. After having come to an understanding of the true, native, original and only sense of the language of the Confessions, we are to test it, just as we should test that of all human productions, by the sole and infallible rule, by which all tenets must be tried, and according to which we should judge all doctrines and all teachers, which rule is found only in the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

In this manner we shall endeavor to discuss the subject which has been committed to us. We shall, in the first place, try to obtain a clear conception of what is said concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day in the Symbols of our Church. To this we will add the testimony of the early teachers of the Church, which, while in itself of no symbolical authority, explains more fully the doctrine held by Evangelical Lutherans. After having thus determined the position of the Lutheran Church, we propose to show that it is not only the view of the portion of the Church with which we are connected, but also of the greater number of learned and devout teachers in other divisions

of the Christian Church, from the days of the apostles until now. We will then examine the testimony of Scripture upon this subject, and consider the Lutheran doctrine of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, as the doctrine likewise of the Word of God. Ordinarily this last point should be considered first. We should begin with the fountain-head, and let the stream of truth bear us along in its current, whithersoever it flows: but as the theme assigned us is not the *Scriptural* Doctrine of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, but the *Lutheran* Doctrine, we are compelled to reverse the mode, and begin at the stream, and follow it up to its source, in order to discover, whether it actually issues from the pure fountains of Israel.

We cannot proceed without having a clear understanding of what is meant by the word *Sabbath*. For we find it used in our Confessions and by our Church writers, as also by the Word of God, both in a restricted and an unrestricted sense; and a failure to observe this distinction will involve us in innumerable contradictions and difficulties. Primarily, the word means rest, and hence is used sometimes to denote simply a day of rest, without necessarily limiting the idea to any special day, or defining the precise mode, in which such rest is to be employed, or referring its origin to any positive divine precept. The term thus used, is generic, and can be as consistently employed by the strongest Dominical as by the strictest Sabbatarian. With this signification Luther uses this word in the introduction to his exposition of the Third Commandment, contained in the Larger Catechism. In its restricted sense it denotes a day of the week set apart by the Third Commandment for rest from all employments, except those which belong directly to divine worship. Some would make this definition still more restricted, by limiting the day to the seventh; but on this point there is but little difference among Christian Churches; those who believe in the perpetuity of the Sabbath, with a few exceptions, maintaining that the change of the day does not change the nature of the institution, and that the Sabbath can be observed as fully on the first as on the last day of the week. We wish to have it borne in mind that we use the term in the restricted sense as above defined, whenever the Sabbath and Lord's Day are placed in antithesis. We are now prepared to state the doctrine of our Church on this subject.

I. THE SABBATH IS AN ORDINANCE OF THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

1. *The Confessions.*

The Augsburg Confession. In introducing the subject of the Sabbath in Art. xxviii. §3*, the Augs. Conf. declares,* "The authors of traditions do contrary to the command of God, when they find matters of sin in foods and *days* and like things, and burden the Church with a servitude of the law, as if there ought to be among Christians in order to merit justification, a service like the Levitical." That this passage does not refer merely to a Judaic strictness in observing the seventh day Sabbath, but to a view of the Sabbath celebrated on its changed day, may be inferred from the succeeding words, "the ordination of which God has committed to the apostles and bishops."

The Sabbath is classed with the ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, in Sec. 59, of the same article, "The Scripture which teaches that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel has abrogated the Sabbath." So also, Sec. 62, "There are certain marvelous disputations touching the changing of the Law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sabbath; which all arose from the false persuasion that there should be a service in the church, like to the Levitical." Let the whole article be read in connection, and its testimony on this point will appear still clearer.

The Larger Catechism. In it Luther says (Decalogue, Sec. 82), "The Sabbath is an outward thing, like all the other ordinances of the Old Testament, which were bound to certain rites, persons, times and places."

2. *The Theologians of the Lutheran Church.*

Luther in his "*Von Himmlischen Propheten*" says: "It is not true that there are no Ceremonies, or Judicial laws in the Ten Commandments. They are there, and belong thereto. That God intends this, is evident from the fact, that he himself has in express words inserted two ceremonies, namely the portions which treat of images and the Sabbath."

Melanchthon in his *Loci Communes* (*Locus, De Lege Di-*

* We have used Dr. Krauth's edition of the Confession in all our references.

vina) says: The commandment concerning the Sabbath has respect to divinely appointed ceremonies, that we are to have regard rather to the design, for which these ceremonies were instituted than to the ceremonies themselves, and that as these ceremonies were prescribed on account of the ministry of teaching, the commandment concerning the Sabbath has respect to this ministry. Near the close of the chapter, he says: "Ceremonies divinely instituted are types of Christ; hence the Jews could not perform aright the works required by this commandment, unless they had a true knowledge of Christ." In these words he expressly recognizes the Sabbath as a type of Christ, and consequently as an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law. We are aware that several sentences of this *Locus* are susceptible of a different interpretation, but a careful study of the passages in their connection will show that such an interpretation is unjust to the author.

John Brentz in his *Homilies on Luke*, (published 1537) says: "Some laws are natural; others are positive. Positive laws are either judicial or ceremonial. Natural laws which are otherwise known by the name of ethical, or moral, are those which God impressed upon man's natural reason, and afterwards proclaimed through Moses, partly in the Decalogue, and partly elsewhere. These are to worship and reverence God, and proclaim his name, to honor parents and magistrates, not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, and briefly, to love one's neighbor as oneself, and what you would not have done to you, not to do to another. Positive laws derive their origin from natural laws, and are such, as divine ordination has appointed for the preservation of public government; and inasmuch as government is two-fold, ecclesiastical and civil, so also, these positive laws. Those which are ecclesiastical, are called ceremonial. They are such as have been instituted for the purpose of teaching and preserving the true faith in the Church. There are many of these in the laws of Moses; such as the ordinance of circumcision, the Sabbath, sacrifices and the whole Levitical cultus."

Chemnitz in his "*Examen Concilii Tridentini*," (published 1565), in the article *De Diebus festis*, says: "In the Old Testament, God, by means of times, weeks, months and days, so distributed the pedagogical remembrances and signification of his benefits and promises, of divine wor-

ship, the exercises of piety and salvation in eternal life, that at stated times he assembled the people to hear the Word, to meditate upon the divine blessings and promises, to offer prayers, praise, thanksgiving, and perform the public exercises of Divine worship. Thus in order to recognize and seek God's care and protection in the daily affairs of this life, and to pray for the forgiveness of sins, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, every day at morning and evening there were church assemblies. Afterwards, among the days of the week, the festival of the Sabbath was appointed, in commemoration of the blessings conferred in Creation and Providence (Ex. 20,) of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and in token of the inner or spiritual and eternal Sabbath (Heb. 4.) In the months he appointed "the New Moons," that men might be led to regard the motion of the heavenly bodies, and the change of seasons as a peculiar work of God. At the beginning and end of the year, he instituted festivals for the remembrance and celebration of the blessings which during the entire year He had afforded the people in the Church, the state and the family." So Chemnitz proceeds, likewise, to enumerate other festivals with their designs, such as Pentecost, the feast of Tabernacles, the year of Jubilee, the festivals of Purim and Encaenia, and continues: "These festivals which he thus instituted, God defined by certain ceremonies, by which with rest from all servile works from evening to evening, he wished them to be celebrated, prescribing the number of days, the sacrifices, and the rites which should be employed, and adding, thereto, threatenings of punishment against those who would profane them."

In his *Loci Theologici*, (published 1591) Chap. iv : 3, the same author says: "Here belong the solemnities of the Law. 1. The Sabbath. 2. The New Moon. 3. The Passover. 4. Pentecost. 5. The Feast of Trumpets. 6. The Feast of Atonement. 7. The Feast of Tabernacles. 8. The Feast of Dedication." In his comment upon Melancthon's explanation of the Third Commandment, he says: "Because at the very beginning of the world, long before the law of Moses, God sanctified the seventh day, its observance seems to be not merely ceremonial." Then follows a statement of erroneous inferences which Augustine De Burgo and other schoolmen had derived from this apparent inclusion of the Sabbath in the moral law, upon which he remarks: "But this manifestly conflicts with

Paul, Gal. 4: 10; Col. 2: 16. That the reason which is attached to the Third Commandment is not moral, but typical and pedagogical, can be clearly proven from the New Testament. For Col. 2: 17, numbers the Sabbath among the shadows of future things; the objects of which it is the type are explained in Heb. 4: 4. In the Old Testament, likewise, God calls the Sabbath a sign, Ex. 31: 13; 20: 20." So, also, afterward, "There is no obscurity as to what the Sabbath signified. 1. Concerning creation, it taught that the world neither originated, nor was governed by chance. 2. It was a sign that men were created not alone for the exercises and actions of this world; but that they would be transferred to a perpetual Sabbath, where God would be all in all. 3. It was a sign signifying that sanctification was not a work of our own strength, but a gift of God. 4. It was a sign of mortification, signifying that we should rest from our labors."

Starke's Synopsis refers to *Chrytraeus* another of the authors of the Form of Concord, as holding the same position.

Polycarp Lyser in an exposition of Luke XIV. in the "*Chemnitz-Lyser—Gerhard Harmony of the Gospels*," in explaining the reason for the change of the day for public worship, says that "the Apostles were induced thereto by the fact that the Sabbath was only a sign, like all the other shadows and figures of the law. It was a sign, 1. Of Creation; 2. Of Redemption; 3. Of Sanctification; 4. Of Self-denial; 5. Of the Eternal Sabbath."

Dr. John Gerhard, in an exposition of the Third Commandment contained in his *Loci Theologici*, declares the existence of a ceremonial as well as a moral element in the command. The moral part refers to attendance upon the ministry of the Word; whilst the ceremonial part has reference to the sanctification of the seventh day, *i. e.*, the celebration of the Jewish Sabbath. In his introduction to *Locus XII.* on the Law of God, he refers his readers to the *Loci* of Chemnitz for certain rules, by which the Moral is to be distinguished from the Ceremonial Law. A reference to Chemnitz, shows his first rule to be: "*That is moral which was impressed upon the consciences of men from the creation*; and as in a note to his own *Loci*, Gerhard adds, "Moses says that God rested on the seventh day, but he does not say that either its blessings or sanctification had been enjoined upon man, neither is there in Genesis any trace of the sanctification of the seventh day, before the giving of the law," it is evident that he regards the sancti-

fication of the seventh day, as belonging to the Ceremonial Law.

It must, however, be conceded, that Gerhard is not at all times clear in his treatment of this subject. Some passages accord with the testimony of our Confessions and our earlier Theologians; whilst others contain the germ of the Sabbatarian view, which was afterwards more fully developed in Calov and Quenstedt.

The next writer whose views may be cited, is *Abraham Calov*. His testimony we find to conflict with that of the other theologians, to whom we have referred. In his introduction to his *Biblia Illustrata* (*Chronicon Biblicum*, Sec. 1: Art. 2,) he discusses in the affirmative, the question whether the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and in his exposition of Exodus XX. he maintains with great learning, that the Sabbath does not belong to the Ceremonial but to the Moral law. Quoting the statement of Grotius, that the commandment has both a moral and a ceremonial part, he says that he is willing to grant that there is something ceremonial in the commandment, but that this is the rigor, with which the Law commanded the Sabbath to be kept, "the rigor of the Law by which persons were prohibited from going from their houses, from kindling fires and bearing a burden; but that the moral part is that a certain day of the week is holy, on which men and beasts should cease entirely from their labors."

Quenstedt follows *Calov* closely, devoting several pages of his *Theologia Didactico-polemica* to the proof of the moral obligation of the Sabbath.

Baier, in his *Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ*, evidently following *Calov*, but not going to the same extreme, finds in the Third Commandment a moral obligation to devote one day in the week to divine worship, considering the ceremonial part of the commandment to be the limitation of the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week, although he at the same time keeps distinctly in view the day, not so much as a day of rest, as a day of worship. "The Third Commandment enjoins the sanctification of the Sabbath, or the consecration of a certain day to the exercise of Divine worship, *especially to public services*." *Baier's* Sabbatarianism is of a very mild type, one third of his remarks upon the Third Commandment consisting of a quo-

* Preuss' Edition, p. 483.

tation from the strong Dominical language of the Larger Catechism.*

Hollazius is also a mild Sabbatarian. Whilst in clear and unmistakable language, like Baier, he ascribes all the value of the Sabbath to the worship afforded by it, he also makes it a part of the Moral Law, declaring that the Moral Law is contained in the indefinite cardinal number seven, or the obligation to devote a day in seven to divine worship, whilst the Ceremonial Law refers to the definite and ordinal number seventh, or the obligation to sanctify the seventh day. He closely follows Calov, using the same arguments, and in many places the very same language.*

Buddaeus in his *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*,† takes the same position, maintaining the origination of the Sabbath at the creation of the world, its perpetuation in the time of the patriarchs, and its consequent moral obligation.

Buddaeus closes the line of orthodox theologians who precede the era of Rationalism; hence, with him, our reference to distinctive Lutheran theologians must cease. We have presented the teachings of the Confessions on this point, and have seen the harmony between them and all the earlier theologians down to Calov.‡ We may mention from among many other of our later theologians, the respected names of Mosheim and Hengstenberg§ as defenders of the position maintained in our Confessions, that the Sabbath is entirely of a Ceremonial character.

3. *The Testimony of the Early Churches.*

But is not the doctrine that the Sabbath is an ordi-

* *Examen Theologicum, De Verbo Legis*, Q. 31.

† Part 2, Chap. 3, Sec. 2: 32-35.

‡ Prof. Walthers' valuable series of articles on this subject, in the *Lehre und Wehre*, 1864-65, has reached us since this article has been placed in the hands of the printer. Prof. W. appropriately remarks in this connection: "It is not indeed to be denied that the doctrine concerning Sunday, taught by the Lutheran Confessions, and by Luther himself, and his immediate successors, even in the seventeenth century already, was not faithfully maintained by many who otherwise were confessedly faithful teachers of our Church, yea, indeed, it was even perverted by some."

§ Hengstenberg's treatise "*Ueber den Tag des Herrn*," has been translated into English, and published by the Clarks of Edinburgh.

nance of the Ceremonial Law, a doctrine confined to the Confessions and earlier theologians of the Lutheran Church? We maintain that it is not; but that on this point, Lutheranism agrees with the almost unanimously concurring testimony of the Christian Church, down until the purity of apostolic doctrine had been corrupted by Romish errors; with the testimony of the Church of the Reformation in its different branches, until Puritanism had introduced into some portions of it a refined legalism, and with the firm belief of many of the most learned and devout theologians of all organizations, which deserve the name of Churches, since that day.

The Epistle of Barnabas may not be authentic, but it is of very early origin, and expresses views almost universally entertained in the first centuries of Christianity. It refers to the Sabbath as a type, foreshadowing the Millennium.*

Ignatius, in his "Epistles to the Magnesians," (116,) refers to the Sabbath as a Jewish ordinance.† Justin Martyr, (140) in his "Dialogues with Trypho," says: "The fathers before Abraham, and Abraham himself, pleased God without keeping the Sabbath, that as before Abraham's days, there was no need of circumcision, so before those of Moses, there was no need of the Sabbath, and feasts of offering."‡ Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, (178) says: "Abraham, without Circumcision and without observance of Sabbaths, believed in God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. This is an evidence of the symbolical character of those ordinances, and of their inability to render the comers thereunto perfect."§ So, also, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen, speak in the same manner, classing the Sabbath with other Jewish ceremonies. Eusebius (315) says: "It was part of the legislation of Moses; those before Moses were free from it." So, also, Macarius, (345) "It was a type and shadow of the true Sabbath given by the Lord to the soul." Gregory, of Nyssa, says that it was "part of the old law, and to be classed with the other ordinances of the law, circumcision,

* Hefele *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*.

† Quoted by Chemnitz, Gerhard, Barrow and Hessey.

‡ Quoted by Barrow and Hessey.

§ Quoted by Barrow and Hessey.

|| Hessey.

distinctions of meat, sacrifices and the like. "The scope of all these was allegorical." To the same effect is the testimony of Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Théodoret.* Down to the end of the seventh century, it was the universally prevalent opinion. Then, however, the increased number of holidays which had been gradually introduced, had so weakened the regard for the Lord's Day, that the Church, in order to remedy this error in practice, began to resort to an error in doctrine, by teaching that the Lord's Day was the Sabbath, and the Sabbath was a part of the moral law. But this view was not universally adopted. It was protested against by Bernard, Gregory the Great, and others.* In fact such is the character of the testimony of the early Church on this subject, that Chambers' Encyclopedia says, "In the next generation the revival of the study of ancient literature led to a fresh advocacy of *Lutheran* views concerning the Sabbath."

4. *The Lutheran Doctrine, as held by those of Other Churches.*

Coming down to the era of the Reformation, we find the Reformers almost unanimous on this subject. In addition to our Lutheran theologians, Wiclif, Tyndale, Peter Martyr, Calvin, Beza, Bucer, the Catechism of Geneva and the Helvetic Confession concurred in the ceremonial character of this ordinance. Calvin's words are noteworthy. In his Institutes he is particularly severe on those who in former ages had imbued mankind with Jewish ideas, such as developed themselves in the assertion that while the ceremonial part of the command, that is, the observance of the seventh day was abolished, its moral part which they stated to be the observance of one day in seven remained. "What is this," says he, "but to insult the Jews by changing the day, while they imitate the Jews, by observing one which they invest with the same sanctity."† Francis Gomarus, Professor at Leyden, and the champion of Calvinism against Arminius, published his *Examen Sabbati* in order to maintain the same position. Two of his colleagues, Cocceius and Heidanus, with Burmann of Utrecht, and Maresius of Groeningen, supported these views in the con-

* Gerhard and Hessey.

† See Dr. Hessey's Bampton Lectures for 1860; for this as well as other authorities in this section and the former.

‡ Starke's Synopsis on Exodus 20.

troversy on this subject, which, during the middle of the seventeenth century, so violently agitated the Reformed Church in Holland. Among the Roman Catholics, they were defended by Bonfrere, and among the mystics by the Beresburg Bible.† In the Church of England, the ceremonial character of the Sabbath has been maintained by Bishops Whitgift, Prideaux and White, Dr. Heylin and Dr. Young, whose work was highly extolled by Richard Baxter. Baxter advocated the same position, as did also Milton, Jeremy Taylor, Bishops Bramhall, Stillingfleet and Nicholson, likewise Thorndike, Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, and M'Knight in his Commentary on the Epistles.§ Dr. Isaac Barrow in his exposition of the Decalogue, argues that the Sabbath was an institution like that of Circumcision, for the purpose as he says, to obsignate the covenant, made with the children of Israel after their delivery from Egypt.** Dr. Paley devotes a whole chapter of his Moral Philosophy to prove that the observance of the Sabbath is not enjoined by the Moral Law. Bishop Kaye on Justin Martyr, Archbishop Whately, in his "Thoughts on the Sabbath," and Dr. Whewell in his "Elements of Morality," take the same position, which is also supported by the late Dr. Arnold, and among living writers by Dean Alford, Dr. Hessey, Dr. Norman M'Leod, Neale, Donville, Maurice, Cox, Hook, Reichel, Powell, Bannerman, Evanson and others † Vinet, in his Pastoral Theology maintains the ceremonial character of the Sabbath. The following works of reference agree with our Church in its view of this ordinance, Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, Smith's Bible Dictionary, Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia (revised edition), the Encyclopedia Americana, the New American Encyclopedia and Chambers' Encyclopedia. Thus the Lutheran view is supported by an array of the best authorities, which claims for it the most serious consideration.

5. *Does the Word of God likewise teach the Ceremonial Character of the Sabbath?*

Let us next apply this doctrine to the touch-stone of God's Word, in order to test whether it be good or evil, true or false. An examination of this kind, will show us

* Barrow's Works, American Edition, Vol. III. : 26.

† Chambers' Encyclopedia.

‡ Hessey.

that all the objections, which can be urged against the words of our Confessions, on this point, apply likewise to the statements of Revelation. Its testimony as to the ceremonial character of the Sabbath, is very clear. Even in the Old Testament, we find it called a sign. Ex. 31 : 17 : "It is a *sign* between me and the children of Israel forever." Ez. 20 : 12 : "I gave them my Sabbaths to be a *sign* between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Ez. 20 : 20 : "Hallow my sabbaths ; and they shall be a *sign* between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." So, also, in the New Testament. Col. 2 : 17. "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."

This seems at first sight to conflict with the requirement of the Third Commandment, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. But in this connection we must recollect that the Ten Commandments contain a summary, not only of the Moral Law, but also of the Political and Ceremonial. Thus the introduction to the Commandments, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," is acknowledged by all as not of universal application, but only as pertaining to the children of Israel. So also the promise added to the Fourth Commandment, "That thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," pertains only to the Jews, although the leading idea which runs through it, refers to all who observe this precept, viz. : That honor shown parents will be accompanied by God's blessing. Hence the inclusion of this precept in the Ten Commandments does not necessarily prove that it is throughout moral. For the moral obligation of a precept does not depend upon its inclusion in the laws of Moses, but upon other circumstances, according to which we propose to examine this institution.

In order to prove the moral obligation of the Sabbath, it is necessary to prove that the Sabbath was given to man at the creation of the world. But the holy records have no testimony to this effect. Gen. 2 : 3, indeed says, "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it ;" but this language is entirely inadequate to prove that this ordinance was then delivered to our first parents ; for we must recol-

lect that this inspired record was written not directly after the occurrence mentioned, but after an interval of some two thousand years had elapsed, and hence, it was very natural for the inspired writer, in recording the history of creation, to refer to the memorial of it, the Sabbath, which was afterwards instituted. "It must in candor," says Kitto's Cyclopedia, "we think, be admitted that it does not necessarily follow that the institution of the day, as a day that was to be devoted to rest, social enjoyment and worship, dates from that time. The reference may have been proleptical. It is possible, assuredly that the writer may here refer to it, because he is treating of events, in relation to which, though at a later date the Sabbath was instituted."

Even if the reference should not be of this kind, and if it should refer to an event cotemporaneous with God's rest, from the fact that at the creation of the world, God set apart the Sabbath for divine worship, we are not compelled to infer that the observance of the Sabbath was then enjoined upon man. For as God's purposes, and his proclamation of his purposes are two very different things, the sanctification here referred to, may be as properly regarded *prospective* as otherwise. Just as in God's purpose, Christ was slain from the foundation of the world, and yet the purpose was not accomplished until the fulness of time had come, so also with regard to the Sabbath.

We are compelled to one, or the other, or both of these positions (for they do not contradict each other), from the fact that there is not the least reference in Scripture, to a celebration of the seventh day, or a fixed day for religious worship, during the age of the patriarchs. "We find," says Archbishop Bramhall, "oblations, and priests, and sacrifices, and groves or oratories, and prayers, and thanksgivings, and whatsoever natural religion doth dictate about the service of God; but we find not one instance of the supposed law of the seventh day Sabbath."

The next mention of the Sabbath after that in Gen. 2: 3, we find in Exodus XVI, in connection with the narration of the giving of manna. The evident ignorance of the Sabbath, which the people here display, as is shown in their surprise at the double portion on the sixth day, and the particularity with which Moses explains its design, and tells them of the institution of the Sabbath, which he bids them observe on the morrow, shows that this was the original promulgation of God's sanctification of that day.

"In my opinion," says Dr. Paley, "the transaction in the wilderness was the first actual institution of the Sabbath. For if the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import, and if it had been observed all along from that time to the departure of the Jews out of Egypt, a period of about two thousand years; it appears unaccountable that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it should occur: nor is there any intimation in this passage that the Sabbath when appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten or suspended."*

On the contrary, we find in the Word of God, allusions to the fact that the Sabbath was originally given in the wilderness. Ex. 20: 10-12. "I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness, and I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments which if a man do he shall live even in them. Moreover, also, I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign," &c. Compare Neh. 9: 12-14.

Again, in order to determine that the Sabbath is of moral obligation, it is necessary that we should find Moses and the prophets declaring its observance obligatory not only upon the Jews, but also upon others. We find, however, no such declaration, but on the contrary, language of this kind: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." Ex. 31: 17. "*The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations.*" v. 16.

If the Sabbath were an ordinance of the Moral Law, we would find among the precepts of the New Testament a re-assertion of its claims. But although it is frequently mentioned in the Gospels, there is not a single reference to its moral obligation. There is, therefore, no disagreement between those portions of the Word of God which call the Sabbath a sign, and other passages which at first sight seem to teach otherwise.

Like other ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, the Sabbath was, at the same time, commemorative of the past, significative of the present, and emblematic of the future. It told of God's goodness in creation, and in leading his people from Egyptian bondage. It distinguished the chil-

* Moral Philosophy, Chap. VII.

dren of Israel from the idolatrous nations by which they were surrounded. It foreshadowed the blessings of Christ, through whom the Sabbath of the soul would be attained, when resting from its own labors without the deeds of the law, it would be justified by His grace, and be enabled to keep a perpetual Sabbath, not doing its own works, or finding its own pleasure, or speaking its own words, but through Christ its life, living, and eating, and drinking, and doing all things for God's glory. "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his." It likewise foretold the eternal Sabbath into which the believer delivered from the labors and sufferings of this life enters, in which the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest.

II. THE SABBATH HAS THEREFORE BEEN ABROGATED.

Regarding the Sabbath in this light, the Lutheran Church could not do otherwise than consider it as abrogated. Hence the Augsburg Confession (Art. XXVIII: §39) as already quoted, says: "The authors of tradition do contrary to the command of God, when they find matters of sin in food, in *days* and like things, and burden the Church with the servitude of the law, as if there ought to be among Christians, in order to merit justification, a service like the Levitical." * * * "Why, therefore, do they increase sins by these traditions? For there are divers clear testimonies, which prohibit the making of such traditions, either to merit grace, or as things necessary to salvation. Paul saith to the Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Again, "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances." Again still more clearly, §59. "The Scripture, which teacheth that all Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath;" and in the next section, "For this cause also seemed pleasing, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the Sabbath, nor of another day, was of necessity." The 61st Section speaks of "Certain marvelous disputations touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, *and the change of the Sabbath,*" and concludes in reference to them in Sec. 64, "What else are such disputations, but

snare for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate tradition, yet the equity of them can never be perceived, so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth, which must needs remain where the righteousness of faith and Christian liberty are not known."

In the exposition of the Third Commandment, the Larger Catechism says: "With respect to this external cessation from labor, this commandment was designed for the Jews only." Again: "This commandment with respect to its outward and literal sense does not concern us Christians: for it is wholly an outward thing, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, confined to certain rites, persons, times and places *which are all now abrogated through Christ.*"

Luther, "*Von Himmlischen Propheten*," says: "God wishes to show that these two parts," (i. e. the prohibition of images and the injunction of the Sabbath) "are ceremonies, which accordingly have been abolished in the New Testament. For St. Paul in Col. 5: 16, 17, speaks clearly and freely. He abolishes it by name, and calls it a shadow which has vanished, since the body, which is Christ, has come. Likewise, in Gal. 4: 10, 11, he calls it lost labor to keep days and fasts, among which is the Sabbath." Again a few pages afterward he says: "That the Sabbath or Sunday, is to be kept holy, is not necessary on account of the command of Moses."* In his explanation, of Exodus XX, he says: "Whosoever would make a necessary command out of the Sabbath, as a work required of God, must keep Saturday and not Sunday, because the keeping of Saturday, and not of Sunday was commanded the Jews. But Christians have hitherto kept Sunday, and not Saturday, because Christ rose on Sunday: this, therefore, is a certain sign that the Sabbath has nothing more to do with us. Yea, the whole Moses has nothing more to do with us, or we should have to keep Saturday. This, therefore, is a great and strong proof that the Sabbath is abolished. For at no place in the entire New Testament, do we find a commandment for us Christians to keep the Sabbath." * * * "That the Sabbath is free, Christ shows here and there in various places in the Gospel, where he explains the nature of the Sabbath."†

Chemnitz in his *Loci Theologici*, says: "The schoolmen

* Luther's works, Erlangen edition, Vol. XXIX.

† Ib. XXXVI, *Lehre und Wehre*, 10: 326-331.

contend that the Sabbath has been transferred rather than abrogated. For they say that just as the Jews were bound to the seventh day, so the Third Commandment places a similar obligation upon us to observe the first or Lord's Day. Hence, they command, that all Lord's days should be celebrated from evening to evening, just as the Jewish Sabbath. But this evidently conflicts with Paul, Gal. 4: 10; Col. 2: 16, who says, that the Sabbath has been so abrogated, that we are not bound to any fixed day, by reason of the number seven (*septenarii numeri*), just as Isaiah likewise predicted, Is. 66: 23. Therefore, in the New Testament, we are under no obligation to observe a seventh number." "The apostles and early Christians," says the same writer in another place, "did not assemble together on the Sabbath, lest they might seem to conform to the Jewish idea concerning the laws of Moses." The testimony of the *Examen Concilii Tridentini* on this subject is as follows: "In the commandment concerning the sanctification of the Sabbath, the New Testament has not abrogated the genus which is moral, but the species which is ceremonial, viz.: that according to which, by the express command of God, the congregations in the Old Testament were appointed certain circumstances of times to which they were bound. These circumstances included the day on which the Sabbath was to be celebrated, the month, the day of the month, and through how many days the other feasts were to be observed, when they should begin and end, viz., from evening to evening, what feasts were to be celebrated at Jerusalem, and what could be celebrated elsewhere, what rites they were to use in the celebration, as well as the abstinence from other works to such an extent that on the Sabbath it was not lawful to depart from one's own dwelling, nor to kindle a fire. These circumstances, and their necessary observance, are abrogated in the New Testament. The apostles at first tolerated the weakness of faith in those who without superstition observed Mosaic days, adding in Rom. 14, that those who were stronger in faith, judged that since the abrogation of the Old Testament, all days in themselves considered were alike, and that one was not holier than another."

It is unnecessary to cite other passages. This position is a necessary inference from the proposition that the Sabbath is an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law. It must, however, be conceded that whilst this is the view of our

Confessions and our older Theologians, some of our later Theologians dating from the middle of the seventeenth century down, on this point, as on the former, teach differently, considering the Sabbath as of moral and perpetual obligation: and basing the observance of the Lord's Day directly upon the Third Commandment.

When we come to consider the testimony of other writers, we find that all, who hold to the ceremonial character of the Sabbath, (in the sense in which we have used the term,) consider this ordinance, likewise, as abrogated. A few quotations will suffice.

Augustine, on John 1:4, says: "The Christian observes the Sabbath spiritually, abstaining from servile work. For what is meant 'from servile works?' From sin. How prove we this? Ask the Lord. Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. So that on us likewise is enjoined the spiritual observance of the Sabbath." So, also, on Ps. 92, "God proclaims to us a Sabbath. Where is it? It is in the heart within us. For many are idle with their limbs while they are disturbed in conscience. Every bad man cannot have a Sabbath; for his conscience is never at rest, he must needs live in turmoil, but he who has a good conscience is tranquil, and that very tranquility is the sabbath of the heart. For it listeneth to the promises of the Lord; and if it toils in the present, it expands in the hope of the future, and every cloud of sorrow is calmed, as the apostle saith, Rejoicing in hope."

Bengel, in his Gnomon, says: "The Sabbath is not commanded, not enjoined: the Lord's Day is mentioned, not enjoined. A stated day is useful and necessary to those who are engrossed in worldly concerns. Those who keep a continual Sabbath, enjoy greater liberty. The Sabbath is a type even of eternal things; yet its obligation does not therefore continue in the New Testament, otherwise the new moons should be retained."

The Lutheran view of the abrogation of the Sabbath, as a day, is based upon the obligation of believers to keep a perpetual Sabbath. Luther in his explanation of Exodus xx. says: "The right Sabbath is the spiritual holiday, namely, the observance by the heart of the right Sabbath, which is the appropriate spiritual work of this commandment, and embraces the whole nature of man. This Sabbath Christ imaged forth for us in the grave. There he kept the right Sabbath; there he lay at rest; there he re-

frained from all work. He stands not, he hears not, he sleeps not, he wakes not, he eats not, he drinks not, he moves neither tongue nor pulse, neither hand nor foot. Whosoever, therefore, would keep the right spiritual Sabbath, must be dead with Christ. Nor will any one keep it aright, unless he die aright. But we begin to keep the right Sabbath, if our old Adam and all his works, reason, will, desire, passion, cease: and all that is in us must be godly, as Paul says to the Galatians: "I, through the law, am dead to the Law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." So, also, Gal. 6 : 14: "The cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." The one is dead to the other: the world knows not what I do, and I know not what the world does; they know nothing the one of the other, but are to each other altogether dead and clean gone. But this Sabbath will at last be rightly kept only when we die."

"If we, therefore, live, as Paul says, then will everything be holy, hands and feet, ears, eyes, body and soul, all thoughts; and what I then do, I am certain that God does. When I follow my occupation, I know that God is well pleased; for it is his holy command. If I now also am certain that it is pleasing God, then it is not my work, but God's; for I do it in obedience to God. But if I do my own works, and my neighbors' ears, eyes, tongue, hands and feet, heart and thoughts, are directed according to mine, and not according to God's will, then are they all works which go against faith; therefore, the right works of the right Sabbath are those which proceed from faith, and obedience to God's commands."*

"We Christians," says the Larger Catechism, "should always observe such holiday, performing nothing but holy duties, *i. e.* we should be occupied in the Word of God daily, and bear it on our lips and in our heart." If whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we do all to God's glory, how can any actions be holier than others, how can any period of time be set apart for greater devotion to God's service than another? It is this idea which underlies St. Paul's message to the Romans, "Him that is weak

* Ib. XXXVI, *Lehre und Wehre*, X : 326-331.

in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day to the Lord, he doth not regard it. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself; for whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord." Those who esteemed the celebration of the Sabbath in itself as an essential of Christianity, he rebukes in the words, "Ye observe days and months and times and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." All your time is to be devoted to God's service. Your souls and bodies are to be presented to him as living sacrifices, and the observance of no days or times, or months or years, can remove this obligation. If your heart is at peace with God, if you have ceased from your labors and are permitting God to work in you of his own good pleasure, every hour, every day, every year is a Sabbath. Why then do you seek for another? Is not the observance of times actually a violation of the spiritual Sabbath, inasmuch as through them you seek the performance of such deeds, and the endurance of such mortifications as may merit God's favor? Hence to the Colossians the same apostle writes, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." "Looking at these passages," says Kitto's Biblical Encyclopedia, "it seems impossible, at any rate to deny that he who doubts whether the Christian Sunday was designed to take the place of the Jewish Sabbath, has exceedingly strong ground for his opinion. It is surely very uncandid not to admit it. To say that the apostle really means that these Judaizers should not observe their Sabbath as *Jewish*, but as *Christian*, that while Sabbaths in general were abolished, the Sabbath was still retained, though to be celebrated on another day and for different purposes; that they should not regard with such punctilious observance the seventh day, but that they might, and ought, the first (though he says not a syllable of all this) requires, in the first place proof of which the New Testament furnishes none, and in the second place, would make the reasoning of the apostle nugatory, since his *argument* is to show that

no such days demand the *sort* of observance which the Jewish law required." "While the first day of the week," says Smith's Bible Dictionary, "is more than once referred to, as one of religious observance, it is never identified with the Sabbath, nor are any *prohibitions* issued in connection with the former, while the omission of the Sabbath from the necessary things to be observed by the Gentiles, shows that they were regarded by the apostles as free from obligation in this matter."

The fact that Christ observed the Sabbath day, is sometimes alleged as an argument for its perpetuity. But that this is not valid, is evident, when we consider the truth that one of the designs of our Saviour's work upon earth was to fulfill the entire law, the Ceremonial and Judicial, as well as the Moral. In the fulfillment of this purpose, he was made in all things like unto his brethren. Like them, he was circumcised; like their's, his birth was followed by the ceremonial purification of his mother; like them, he went up to Jerusalem, to attend the yearly festivals. If the Sabbath be made binding upon us, on these grounds, so, also, are Circumcision, the Feast of Tabernacles and the celebration of the Passover.

So, also, some have attempted to show the perpetuity of the Sabbath, from our Saviour's words, "The Sabbath was made for man:" an argument which is in every respect as fallacious as would be an attempt to prove the obligation of specie payments, from the fact that gold was made for man, and not man for gold.

The practice of the apostles, recorded in the book of Acts, such as the sermons of Paul on the Sabbath at Antioch, in Pisidia, at Corinth, at Philippi, and at Thessalonica, is adduced as an argument. But the reply to this, is that they were in search of Jewish audiences, and the opportunity afforded by the assemblies on the Sabbath, was such as they gladly embraced.

Lastly, the fact that the first day of the week was used by the apostles, as a day of worship does not prove a continuance of the Sabbath, for those among them who felt themselves bound to the Sabbath, observed it on its appropriate day.

III. DESIRABLENESS OF A FIXED DAY FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP.

But while the Lutheran Church believes that the Sab-

bath was an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law, and with it has been abrogated since the beginning of the New Dispensation, she does not maintain with the Anabaptists, Schwenckfeldians, Familists, Menonites and others, that "the Sunday is wholly a fiction, and that no special stated day of rest or worship is to be observed." Her position on this point may be concisely stated in the following words, *Yet inasmuch as spiritual life needs the external exercise of attendance upon the public ministry, through which God works, preserves and increases in us sanctification, a fixed or stated day is needed, on which we are to attend God's house, and refrain from all such works as hinder or interfere with the public exercises of divine worship.** The Lutheran Church is far from overlooking the obligation of the assembling of her people together. For attendance upon the Word and Sacraments, time is necessary: and that time must be uniform and consequently fixed, because otherwise disorder and confusion would be introduced into the Church. In order to attend these ordinances, the pursuit of the ordinary avocations of life must, for the time being, be laid aside. So, also, a period of rest before hearing the Word, is of advantage, in order that by the preparation of heart, through private meditation we may be ready for the services of the Sanctuary. In order too, that the heard Word may profit, reflection upon and further study of the truths which have been presented to the mind, with self-examination in order to discover their relations to our own hearts, are necessary. All these objects would be defeated, if the whirl of business were to go on; or if, either before or after having the Word, we should engage in feasting or frolic, or even in the duties of our ordinary avocations. Hence the Lutheran Church believes in setting apart a day of rest and worship, not out of absolute, but out of practical necessity; not on account of any original moral obligation, but from a derived obligation, fundamental to good order. She looks upon this institution, in the same manner as many of us regard Family Worship, or seasons of Morning and Evening prayer: which are not divinely appointed ordinances, but human institutions, for the attainment of divinely appointed ends. The testimony of our Confessions is as follows *Augsburg Confession, XXVIII: §53.* "What is then to be thought of the Lord's Day, and of

* Adapted from Gerhard.

like rites of temples? Hereunto they answer, that it is lawful for bishops or pastors, to make ordinances, whereby things may be done in order in the church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, or think that they sin when they violate them, without offence of others." "Such ordinances it behooveth the churches to keep for charity and quietness sake, so that one offend not another, that all things may be done in order, and without tumult in the church, 1 Cor. 14 : 40. Such is the observance of the Lord's Day, of Easter, of Pentecost and like holidays. For they that think that the observation of the Lord's Day was appointed by the Church instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. And yet because it was requisite to appoint a certain day that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the Church did for that purpose appoint the Lord's Day."

"We keep the Sabbath," says the Larger Catechism, "not for the sake of intelligent and matured Christians" (Luther here uses the word Sabbath in its unrestricted sense); "but in the first place, on account of physical reasons and necessities, which nature teaches and requires for the common mass of people * * *; in the second, mostly for the purpose of enabling us to embrace time and opportunity on these Sabbath days, (since we cannot otherwise embrace them), to attend to divine service, so that we may assemble ourselves to hear and treat of the Word of God, and to praise Him by singing and prayer. But this, I say, is not so confined to time, as it was among the Jews, that it must be precisely this or that day; for one day is not better in itself than another, but it should be daily attended to; but since the common class of people cannot attend to it, we should reserve one day in the week, at least, for this purpose." * * * "Here (*i. e.*, on this day) a work must be performed, through which a person becomes holy himself—a thing, which, as already shown, occurs through the Word of God alone; and to this effect, places, times, persons, and the whole external service of God, are appointed and ordained, so that it may be publicly and assiduously exercised."

Luther in his Explanation of Exodus, says: "Wherefore, then is the Sabbath kept among Christians? Inasmuch as all days are free, and one is like the other, still it

is useful and good, yea, even necessary that we should observe one day, whether Saturday, or Sunday, or any other day. For God desires to conduct the world neatly, and rule it quietly. Therefore, has he given six days to labor, but on the seventh day, servant, hireling and every kind of laborer, yea, even horse, oxen and other beasts of burden should have rest, according to the commandment, in order that they may be thereby recuperated: especially too, that those who at other times have no leisure, may hear preaching on the holy day, and thus learn God's will. For such reason, namely, on account of the body and necessity, Sunday remains, not on account of the commandment of Moses, but on account of our need, that we may rest and learn the Word of God."

Chemnitz' *Examen* may here be quoted, "Nor did the apostles, either by any law or commandment, impose the observance of this day out of necessity, but its observance was free and for the sake of order (*ordinis gratia*)."

"Internal sanctification and spiritual worship," says Gerhard, "are required by the first two commandments; but, inasmuch, as in this life, this spiritual and internal worship needs the external exercise of attendance upon the public ministry, this commandment must be understood as referring to the public ministry of the Word and holy rites. The moral law in this commandment is perpetual, and prohibits all those works which interfere with the external ministry of the Word. Now it is clearly evident, that slothful ease, dances and feasts, conflict with this requirement." Hence, Gerhard condemns, in the strongest terms, a practice prevalent at his time of spending a portion of the day of worship in attending the services of God's house, and the remainder in dancing, feasts, slothful ease, and the like. For he argues that not a few hours of the day are requisite, but the whole day; but yet, at the same time, he states with a great deal of distinctness his opinion that such labors and such enjoyments, as do not conflict with divine worship, should not be prohibited.

IV. THE CHURCH FOLLOWING THE EXAMPLE OF THE APOSTLES' HAS DEVOTED THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK TO THIS SERVICE.

The idea has already been advanced, that the Apostles preferred the first day to the seventh, in order that their celebration of a day of worship might not be understood

as a celebration of the Sabbath. In considering this subject, we must have regard also, to the fact that the Sabbath, like many of the other ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, such as Circumcision, the Passover, etc., was not only a type, but also a memorial. It signalized the completion of the work of Creation. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is; and rested the seventh." It signalized the goodness of an overruling Providence, by whose guidance Israel had been preserved and delivered. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence with a mighty hand, and a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." But whilst thus commemorating the goodness of God as Creator and Preserver, of God as Redeemer the Sabbath told nothing, except as in the future it dimly foreshadowed Him, who is our Rest as well as our Peace. But when the type had been succeeded by the antitype; when the shadow had given way to the substance, when the dim light of the Ceremonial Law had been lost in the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness, then the Christian Church desiring to commemorate the nobler benefits of God, the wonders of his mercy in the gift of his son, set apart as a memorial of the completion of the work of Redemption, that day upon which Christ finished his work by rising from the grave. "They chose the day on which Christ rose," says Chemnitz, "because that by the resurrection of Christ, there was an absolute abrogation of all the shadows of the law, among which the Sabbath is numbered. And they called it the Lord's Day, because they wished the change of the Sabbath into the Lord's day, to be a public profession that by the resurrection of Christ, Christians are freed from the necessity of a difference of days; and that they might declare that in the New Testament, the Lord's Day is observed, not with that necessity, as is the Sabbath in the law, but with that liberty, by which Christ (through his resurrection, the shadow of the distinction of days being abrogated), only for the sake of order and decorum, wished that there should be a certain day fixed on which his followers might assemble."

The setting apart of this day was sanctioned by Christ. On the day of his resurrection, He met with the ten disci-

ples; on the next Lord's day he entered the upper room in which the eleven were assembled. After his Ascension the miraculous scene of Pentecost transpired on a Lord's Day: and in the holy retirement of another, St. John beheld the wonderful Revelation of God's glory in things which must shortly come to pass.

The position of our Church on this subject, cannot be better summed up than in the words by which one* who is not of us, and who greatly misunderstands our Lutheran doctrine, declares his belief. "In no one place in the New Testament is there the slightest hint that the Lord's Day is a Sabbath, or that it is to be observed Sabbatically, or that its observance depends upon the Third Commandment, or that the principle of the Sabbath, is sufficiently carried out by one day in seven being consecrated to God. Whatever the Lord's Day has is its own, not borrowed from the Sabbath, which is regarded for religious purposes as existing no longer." But the question may be asked: Whence then does it happen that we find the Lord's Day treated of under the Third Commandment, in the Larger Catechism, and the *Loci* of Melancthon, Chemnitz, Gerhard and other Lutheran writers? Whence, too, is it that Melancthon in one passage of his "*Loci Communes*," refers the ceremonial part of the Third Commandment to the seventh day, and the moral to the celebration of one day in seven? How is it that this same view is to a certain extent advocated by Gerhard, Baier, and Hollaz, and strenuously insisted upon by Calov and Quenstedt. These questions are important, and of such a nature that, if in answering them, we do not observe the involved distinction, we will fall into error, either by entirely misconceiving the teachings of the Church, or considering our teachers as being far more discordant than they actually are.

Our answer is as follows: The moral part of the Third Commandment refers to the setting apart of time for worship due God. For the purpose of complying with the requirement of this precept, as we have seen, the Church has set apart a stated day, as a human appointment for the attainment of a divinely ordained end. It was very appropriate, therefore, that those of our teachers, who treated of the divine end, should also treat of the human means

* Dr. Hessey.

for its accomplishment. A treatise upon Pastoral Theology instructing the ministry how to fulfill our Saviour's command, "Make disciples of all nations, baptizing and teaching them," would very properly include the subject of Catechization, although this is not of divine but of human appointment. This explains the seeming inconsistency in the Larger Catechism, Melancthon, Chemnitz and Gerhard, as the context clearly shows.

But gradually the human appointment began to be confounded with the divine ordinance. This we ascribe to the introduction of scholastic views into the Church, by an increased study of the schoolmen during the latter part of the seventeenth century; to the growing prevalency of Sabbatarianism in the Reformed Church, in which, since 1598, it had been revived, and to the re-action from the loose views concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Day, as taught by Anabaptists and Antinomians. These facts, with the seeming assent to Sabbatarian views to which we have already alluded, explains the disagreement of some of the teachers in the later days of the age of Orthodoxy, with the doctrine of our Church, as set forth by our Confessions and earlier teachers.

Let no one, therefore, misunderstand our Church on this subject. She utterly repudiates the Sabbath as a day, call it by what name you please. She regards every day as the Sabbath of the believer; and no day as the Sabbath of the unbeliever. The one enjoins rest at all times; the other never. She condemns the observance of the Sabbath day, not because she wishes to deprive her Lord of any time which He asks for his service; but because she demands for Him all time, the six days of labor as well as the seventh day of rest. Whilst rejecting the Sabbath as a part of the Ceremonial Law, she clings with affection to the day on which her Lord rose, as a day to rejoice and be glad in, as a day on which the great congregation can assemble, and join heart and voice, with the Church Triumphant in ascriptions of honor and glory to Him that loved us and gave Himself for us. "Fettered," says Guericke, "by no testaments of law or legal bondage, she keeps it in the spirit of Gospel liberty—a liberty best asserted by such a commemoration." She will allow no one to judge her in respect to the Sabbath day: but at the same time, she will allow no one to deprive her of the Lord's Day.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral. By James M'Cosh, LL. D. *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation.* By James M'Cosh, LL. D., and George Dickie, A. M. M. D. *The Intuitions of the Mind*, inductively investigated. By James M'Cosh, LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. *An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy*, being a Defence of Fundamental Truth. By James M'Cosh, LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. Of the intrinsic value of these works, it is unnecessary to speak. They have been, some time, before the public, and have received the highest endorsement. Their reappearance simultaneously with the transfer of their distinguished author to this country, is very opportune, and will greatly increase the interest in his philosophical discussions. They will now be more generally read than they have ever been, and will go far towards counteracting the sceptical and materialistic theories of the age. Philosophy, Dr. M'Cosh regards in its highest forms. Rejecting all positive idealism, he believes that our perception of God, of the soul and of things, are positive and real, and that correct views of man cannot exist without true views of God. Lucid and comprehensive, the result of intense thought, thoroughly evangelical in spirit and moderate in tone, these works are valuable contributions to the philosophy of the mind, and will take their place with Reid, Stewart, Hamilton and other distinguished writers on the subject of Mental Science.

The Revelation of Law in Scripture: Considered with respect both to its own nature, and to its relative place in successive dispensations. The Third Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. Dr. Fairbairn is well known to the American public as the scholarly author of "Typology of Scripture," and other works, and on every page of the present volume, the author's acquaintance with theological and ethical literature, and his grasp and breadth of thought, are apparent. No important question, which the consideration of so important a subject as the law of God reveals, is passed by, in the course of discussion. Appended to the Lectures are three *Supplementary Dissertations*, and the exposition of the more important passages in St. Paul's writings in reference to the Law, designed to render the discussion of the subject more complete and satisfactory.

Sermons by Henry Ward Beecher, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. In Two Volumes. New York: Harper & Bros. The pulpit utterances of one of the most attractive and popular preachers in this country, are certainly deserving of our attention and consideration. If they are neither profound nor model discourses, they are original, fresh and practical, abounding in beautiful thoughts, forcible illustrations and the most earnest and pungent appeals. The selections have

been made from the published and unpublished discourses of the author, under his own immediate supervision, by Rev. Lyman Abbott.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. John McClintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. II. C. D. New York: Harper & Bros. The second volume of this excellent work has made its appearance, and is a decided improvement on the former issue. Prepared by two eminent scholars in the Methodist Church, there is a constant disposition manifested to treat other Christian denominations with due consideration and candor. We may not be ready to admit every statement, but the spirit of the work is unexceptionable. There may be omissions, but we are surprised, as we turn over its pages, there are not more. It is a work of great merit, able and valuable, combining excellences which no similar production possesses, a monument of vast learning, unwearied industry and indefatigable research. When completed, it will hold a place in the departments of biblical, theological and ecclesiastical knowledge which no other publication supplies. We are gratified to learn that the greater part of the articles for the rest of the work, are already prepared, and that the succeeding volumes may be expected as rapidly, as they can be carried through the press.

Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical, on the Book of Psalms. By Albert Barnes. In three Volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Bros. The mere announcement of a new Commentary by Mr. Barnes, is simply sufficient to secure for the work a large circulation. If these expositions are not so critical as some others, they are better adapted to popular use. They are clear and simple, characterized by common sense; they furnish the results rather than the processes of learned investigation, they are earnest, faithful and devotional, the careful investigations of a scholar, and the rich experience of a Christian. More than half a million of Mr. Barnes' Commentaries have been published in this country, and more than this number in Great Britain, besides translations in the French, Welsh and Chinese, and in the language of India.

The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and that of the Lamentations, translated from the original Hebrew. With a Commentary, critical, philological and exegetical. By E. Henderson. Andover: W. F. Draper. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. This Commentary, which has been before the public for some years, like that of Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets, combines learning and clearness, philological research, critical taste, sound judgment and pure devotion. An introductory dissertation, brief but luminous and instructive, prepares the reader for an appreciative study of the work. The translation, perhaps, sometimes unnecessarily deviates from the approved English version. It is printed in the clear and elegant style for which the Andover press is distinguished.

The Human Intellect: With an Introduction upon Psychology and the Soul. By Noah Porter, D. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. Commencing with a valuable introduction on Psychology, the author proceeds to the main object of the work, the consideration of the Human Intellect—its Function, Development and Faculties. This is done under four heads: (1) Presentation and Presentative Knowledge; (2) Representation and Representative Knowledge; (3)

Thinking and Thought Knowledge; (4) Intuition and Intuitive Knowledge. All these topics are discussed with great thoroughness, ability and learning, showing power of thought and logical acumen, clearness of discrimination and precision of language, not always found in discussions on this subject. Dr. Porter has not followed in the servile track of any single school or leader, but, in the construction of his system, whilst taking, in the main, the Scottish metaphysicians as a guide, he has adopted what is true, and rejected what is false. His teachings are opposed to the materialistic tendencies of the age; they are positive in the spiritual and theistic direction. To those interested in this class of studies, it will prove a most fascinating work. Even those, who are repelled by the abstractions and speculations of Hegel and Hamilton, its pages will attract. The theological student will derive from its study special advantages, especially in these times, when it is necessary successfully to resist the progress of Materialism and Positivism in the land.

Compend of Lutheran Theology. A Summary of Christian Doctrine, derived from the Word of God and the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Dr. Leonard Hutter, formerly Professor at Wittenberg. Translated from the original Latin. By Rev. H. E. Jacobs, and Rev. G. F. Spieker. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book Store, 807 Vine Street. This Compendium, by the Wittenberg Professor, in many respect so much in character like the immortal Luther, has always been regarded as a classic in Lutheran Theology, the study of which Hulseman regarded of no less importance than that of the Symbolical Books, and to its perusal, from a feeling of curiosity, Freymüller ascribed his conversion from Romanism. The work gives a clear and simple exhibit of pure Lutheran Theology, and, although not a complete system, it furnishes the reader with a better idea of what is often called old Lutheranism than the Symbols themselves, which were prepared at different times for special emergencies and special purposes. The subjects are here presented in a more distinct, connected and systematic form. Even those, in our own Church and among other Christian denominations, who may differ from some of the views given, will be glad to have the book for reference. The translation seems idiomatic and natural, and we congratulate our young friends, both of whom were engaged, for a season, in giving instruction in Pennsylvania College, on their success in their first effort in the direction of authorship.

Memorial Volume of the Semi-Centennial Anniversary of Hartwick Seminary, held August 21, 1866. Albany: Joel Munsell. To those who are interested in every thing relating to the past and present history of the Lutheran Church, this is a valuable volume. It contains an Historical Address by Dr. Pohlman, a Poem by Rev. W. Hull, Biographical Sketches of Drs. Hazelius and Miller by Dr. Smith and Mrs. A. Hiller, a description of Hartwick and its surroundings by Dr. Smith, of Dr. Miller's Golden Wedding by Rev. R. Adelberg, together with interesting documentary history connected with the subject. It is embellished with faithful portraits of Drs. Hazelius and Miller, and several fine pictures illustrative of the Seminary. The mechanical execution of the work is beautiful and reflects great credit upon the skill of the publisher.

Three Hundred Years Ago: or the Martyr of Brentwood. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. This is a work of very great interest, and we are glad to see upon its title page the *impro-*

matur of our Lutheran Board. Its scenes are connected with the reign of the cruel and bigoted Mary; it is the record of acts perpetrated in the name and under the sanction of religion, a portraiture of the intolerant spirit of that age.

Watchwords from the Warfare of Life. From Dr. Martin Luther. Translated and arranged by the Author of the "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd. The most of these selections are fresh translations from Luther's own German or Latin, and contain: (1) Words for the Battle-Field; (2) Words for the Day's March; (3) Words for the Halting Places; (4) Words for the Wounded; (5) Words of Victory. What a difference the last twenty years have made in the appreciation of Luther's character and services, and the value of his influence will yet be more generally acknowledged by the whole Protestant community. The volume before us, so beautifully printed, we are sure, will have a wide circulation.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Preceded by a History of the Religious Wars in the Reign of Charles IX. By Henry White. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Bros. The author has, in the preparation of the volume, availed himself of all the material recently discovered, that could shed light on the subject. The facts are woven into a narrative, exceedingly graphic and full of interest.

Ulrich Zwingli, the Patriotic Reformer. A History. By Rev. W. M. Blackburn. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Our author has been quite successful in reproducing the stirring scenes and varied events connected with the times of the great Swiss Reformer. Without any parade of learning, he has brought together, in a spirited and forcible narrative, the leading facts in the life of Zwingli. We do, however, object to some of the statements in the chapter on the Conference at Marburg, as unfair to the Saxon Reformer, and leaving upon the mind of the reader an erroneous impression, in reference to the position he assumed on that occasion.

Moral Uses of Dark Things. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. These discussions, sixteen in number, embrace, under the general subject, a wide range of topics, such as Insanity, Plague and Pestilence, Distinctions of Color, Physical Pain, and contain many profitable thoughts and original suggestions, presented in rich and beautiful language. Although many of the author's views are unsatisfactory, and we instinctively recoil from some of the expressions he utters, we feel that only the hand of a master could have produced such a book.

The Empty Crib: A Memorial of Little Georgie. With Words of Consolation for Bereaved Parents. By Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D. D. New York: R. Carter & Bros. We remember with much interest the bright, beautiful little fellow, and how sad we felt when the tidings of his death reached us. The father has here lovingly gathered up the pleasant memories of an attractive childhood, and skilfully woven them into a beautiful chaplet to be laid upon the little grave. We have, also, a number of letters from sympathizing friends, with useful lessons, showing the value of earthly trials, and the power of the gospel to sustain the soul in the hour of its severest afflictions.

Seeds and Sheaves: or Words of Scripture: Their History and Fruits. By A. C. Thompson, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. The conception of the work is original and the result quite successful. It is a collection of authentic illustrations designed to show the use,

which God has made of particular passages of the divine word in its power over the soul. It is a storehouse of facts and incidents, which may be read with advantage, and used in the pulpit to give point to some important truth.

Pivot Words of Scripture. By Rev. P. B. Power. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This volume, by the author of the "I Wills of the Psalms" and the "I Wills of Christ," takes those little words of Scripture, such as *Then, Here, Yet, And, But, Whence, For*, pivot words, small points, on which something else turns, and makes them the basis of suggestions and themes for reflection and devotion.

The Pearl of Parables. Notes on Luke XV. 11—32. By the late James Hamilton, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. These Notes are written in the author's inimitable style, and abound in illustrations, full of moral instruction and the gospel of Christ.

Symbolism: or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings. By John Adam Moehler, D. D. Translated from the German, with a Memoir of the Author. Preceded by an Historical Sketch of the State of Protestantism and Catholicism in Germany for the last hundred years. By James Burton Robertson, Esq. Translator of Schlegel's Philosophy of History. New York: Catholic Publication House. Dr. Moehler was, for many years, connected with the University of Tübingen, and subsequently with that of Munich. He is well known for his abilities as an author. The works which have most contributed to his reputation are, "Athanasius the Great, or the Church of his time, in her struggle with Arianism;" "Unity in the Church, or the Principle of Catholicism;" "Patristic Literature;" and "The Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants." He died in 1838. In the work before us the author discusses Symbolism—its nature, extent and sources; the Catholic Formularies, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic and Zwinglian, and shows, according to his views of the subject, the differences in doctrine respecting the primitive state of man and the origin of evil, original sin and its consequences, justification by faith, good works, the Sacraments and the Church. The volume is a valuable addition to our polemic theology. Here are presented the views of the Roman Catholic Church, by one of her representatives, a man of acknowledged ability.

Gropings after Truth: A Life Journey from New England Congregationalism to the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. By Joshua Huntington. New York: Catholic Publishing Society. The author of this volume, a native of New England, was educated at Yale, Princeton and Andover, with a view to the Christian ministry. In the narrative before us, he gives an account of the difficulties and struggles, through which he passed, and the successive steps by which he finally reached the Church of Rome. We confess, that we have read the book with deep interest, and, whilst we condemn the course that is often pursued towards our opponents and the denunciatory spirit employed, as calculated to strengthen them in error, its careful perusal has only confirmed us in our Protestant faith.

History of the American Civil War. By John William Draper, M. D. LL. D. In Three Volumes. Vol. II. New York: Harper & Brothers. This volume of Dr. Draper's elaborate work, embraces the events from the Inauguration of President Lincoln and the Proclamation of Freedom to the Slaves, from the 4th of March, 1861, to the 1st of January, 1863, and is divided into seven sections: (1) The

Progress and Culmination of the Conspiracy; (2) Vast Development of the Warlike Operations—Legislative and Military Preparations; (3) Prelude to the great Campaigns; (4) Campaigns for Opening the Mississippi, and piercing the East and West line of the Confederacy; (5) Campaign for the Capture of Richmond; (6) The Blockade, and operations connected with it; (7) Foreign Relations and Domestic Policy of the Republic. In the present volume there is very little allusion to the author's peculiar theories, although clearly recognized, respecting physical conditions and physiological laws, but the legitimate work of the historian is impartially presented in most graphic style. An additional volume will complete the work.

Our Branch and its Tributaries; Being a History of the Work of the North-Western Sanitary Commission and its Auxiliaries, during the War of the Rebellion. By Mrs. Sarah E. Henshaw. Chicago: Alfred L. Sewell. Mrs. Henshaw has furnished, in these pages, a spirited and attractive account of services rendered in the North-West, by the Sanitary Commission, in the alleviation of human suffering and the promotion of the health and comfort of the Army during the late War. These labors cannot be too highly estimated. Some of the scenes described, and incidents connected with the Hospital work, are thrilling. They cannot be read without intense feeling. The paper of the volume, typography, margin of the page, and the binding, are in excellent taste, and afford a fine specimen of a book well made. This, with President Stillé's admirable History of the Sanitary Commission, and Dr. Moss' History of the Christian Commission, are most valuable contributions to the literature of the War.

The old World in its New Face: Impressions of Europe in 1867—1868. By Henry W. Bellows, D. D. Vol. I. & II. New York: Harper & Bros. We have been very much interested in reading the impressions of so intelligent a man as Dr. Bellows, derived from his recent visit to European places of celebrity. Luther and Melancthon, Tholuck and Müller, Hengstenberg and Dörner, and other names, so familiar to us all, occur in the volume. Many things that he says are, doubtless, correct, but the impressions of one with Lutheran culture would, perhaps, on some topics be different. The author thinks that, at present, we seldom draw much reliable instruction from the reports and observations of visitors to Europe, because they do not possess the fluent use of the German and French, and that, therefore, it is of the utmost importance that our Colleges and Schools should use new diligence in drilling their pupils in the speaking of these languages. Why have not Drs. Schmucker, Passavant, Morris, Hay, Stuckenberg and others well qualified for the task, given the Lutheran Church of this country the benefit of their impressions abroad? A book of such reminiscences would be of great interest to the Church.

Scotia's Bards: The choice Productions of the Scottish Poets, with Brief Biographical Sketches. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This is a most beautiful volume, printed on fine tinted paper and in elegant binding, with contents of a striking character, of choice treasures, illustrating the poetical genius of more than thirty of Scotland's gifted sons. In the collection we find that sweet poem by William Knox, commencing, "Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud!" which was so much admired, and so often repeated by our late martyred President.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXVII.

Article.	Page.
<p>I. FOREIGN MISSIONS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By G. A. LINTNER, D. D., Schoharie, N. Y.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>II. LIFE AND LABORS OF OBERLIN,.....</p>	<p>18</p>
<p>III. EXPERIENCE AND PRACTICE AS NECESSARY IN RELIGION, AS IN SCIENCE,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By G. B. MILLER, D. D., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.</p>	<p>35</p>
<p>IV. MELCHISEDEC,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. B. GROSS, Easton, Pa.</p>	<p>50</p>
<p>V. THE CONFLICT IN THE CHURCH,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. S. A. HOLMAN, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.</p>	<p>58</p>
<p>VI. CODEx SINAITICUS,.....</p>	<p>71</p>
<p>VII. HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR WORSHIP?.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By J. A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>79</p>
<p>VIII. THE REFORMATION: ITS OCCASION AND CAUSE,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Professor CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>94</p>
<p>IX. THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,.....</p>	<p>117</p>
<p>X. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE SABBATH, AND THE LORD'S DAY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Phillipsburg, Pa.</p>	<p>125</p>
<p>XI. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....</p>	<p>153</p>

The October number of the *Evangelical Quarterly Review* presents a substantial and valuable table of contents. This is the organ of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, is published at Gettysburg, and is edited by our esteemed brother Dr. M. L. Stoever, Professor in Pennsylvania College.—*National Baptist, (Philadelphia.)*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* has quite a number of excellent articles. We have marked passages for extracts, for which we shall endeavor to find space in our columns.—*The Evangelist, (New York).*

The October number of this *Quarterly* is one of more than usual interest and variety. The Rev. Dr. Schmucker opens with an article, which evinces that the author has not lost the vigor of his intellect with increasing years. Rev. Cyrus Thomas discusses the various themes which prevail in regard to Regeneration. The article on the Third Commandment possesses solidity and depth. The Homiletical value of *Cicero de Oratore* is a production of considerable interest and value. The article by Professor Ferrier takes a very sensible view of works of fiction, popularly termed Novels. Full Fidelity to God's Gifts is ably and forcibly discussed.—*Reformed Church Messenger, (Phila.)*

The *Quarterly* deserves more notice than it usually receives. The article by Rev. H. E. Jacobs on the *Third Commandment*, and that by Rev. J. D. Severinghaus on the *Homiletical Value of Cicero de Oratore*, will richly reward an attentive study. That by Prof. Ferrier on *Novels* may be read with no small degree of interest, whilst the Biographical Sketches by the Editor, bear testimony to the fidelity and value of his researches.—*Lutheran & Missionary, (Philadelphia.)*

The *Third Commandment*, translated from Gerhard, is a valuable article, the very thing a religious teacher wants. The *Homiletical Value of Cicero de Oratore* is instructive and suggestive. Full Fidelity to God's Gifts is delightful reading, earnest, true, safe and sound Christian counsel. Prof. Stoever is doing a good work in rescuing from oblivion the memory of the faithful laborers in the Lord's vineyard.—*Lutheran & Visitor, (Columbia, S. C.)*

The October number contains among other articles the Third of the Holman Lectures on the Augsburg Confession, by Dr. S. S. Schmucker. The discussion of the III. Article of the Confession, embracing the Incarnation, the Christology and Soteriology, is in the Doctor's translucent and logical style, scholarly, elaborative and exhaustive.—*Lutheran Observer, (Philadelphia.)*

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXVIII.

APRIL, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

By Prof. C. J. EHREHART, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

The future of man—his state and condition after death, the place and nature of his final abode,—these are questions of deep interest, as well as of practical importance.

We propose, in the present article, to discuss *the Intermediate State—the State of Man between Death and the Resurrection*. At death, as is generally believed, a separation of the soul and body takes place; at the resurrection, a re-union of these parts of our being will occur. The time, therefore, that intervenes between these two events, is regarded as the *Intermediate State*. Our aim will be to consider this subject in the light of the Sacred Scriptures. We will endeavor to produce the mind of the Spirit. However interesting and entertaining mere speculation might be, it would not, in the end, prove of much real benefit; it might even lead to actual error. By adhering

to the Inspired Record, we shall be treading upon safe ground.

As preliminary to the discussion of the Intermediate State, we shall consider

Death in its Relations to Man.

Whatever may be our view of man's original state with reference to his immortality—whether we regard him as invested with a native immortality, or whether, originally subject to decay, we regard his immortality the gift of the Tree of Life that grew in the midst of the Garden of Eden, is not material in this discussion. It is very evident from the Scriptures, that death in its three-fold aspects,—death temporal, death spiritual, and death eternal,—is the fruit of sin; that if man had not sinned, he would not have died. (Gen. 2 : 17 ; 3 : 17—19 ; Rom. 5 : 12—21 ; 6 : 3 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 21, 22.)

The death, with which we have more particularly to do in our discussion here, is temporal or physical death, that death which terminates man's earthly existence and removes him from our sight.

The Effect of Death upon the Body.

The effect of death upon the *body* is easily recognized. It deprives it of all vitality, so that the limbs cease to move, the blood to circulate, the pulse to beat, and the heart to throb. Death leaves the body a mass of corruption, and resolves it again to dust, its native element. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," was spoken of the body, of the material part of man, and this is its destiny until the morning of the resurrection. The Scriptures represent the death of the *body* by a great variety of expressions, some of which are highly figurative, and have given rise to much misapprehension. They have, in many instances, been made to apply to the soul, and thus have given rise to dangerous errors. It is to the *body* the sacred writers refer, when they speak of man as *returning to the dust*, (Gen. 3 : 19) *to the earth* ; (Eccl. 12 : 7) as *going to the grave*, (Eccl. 9 : 10) *to the land of forgetfulness* ; (Ps. 88 : 12) as *going down to the pit*, (Ps. 30 : 9 ; Isa. 38 : 18, 19) *to silence*, (Ps. 115 : 17). They have the same reference when they speak of death as *a sleep*, (Jno. 11 : 11—15) *a dead sleep*, (Ps. 76 : 6) as *sleeping a perpetual sleep*, (Jer. 51 : 39, 57). So, also, when they use the terms,

a destruction, (Ps. 90 : 3) a perishing forever, (Job 4 : 20) a rooting out of the land of the living, (Ps. 52 : 5) a putting off of this tabernacle, (2 Pet. 1 : 14) a dissolution of the earthly house of this tabernacle, 2 Cor. 5 : 1). By applying these, and other similar expressions, to the body, as was clearly intended, we will be preserved from some misapprehension, into which others have fallen.

The Effect of Death upon the Soul.

The effect of death upon the soul, upon the immaterial part of man, is not so easily understood. It does not come within the range of our observation, and hence we are dependent upon other sources for our knowledge. On this subject a great variety of opinions has prevailed, both in ancient and modern times; both among those having a Revelation and those without it. We are concerned more especially with the views of those who have a Divine Revelation and who base their views upon that revelation. Amongst these there is considerable diversity of sentiment, yet they may all be arranged into several leading classes, with the one or the other of which there is, as a general thing, substantial agreement. It is maintained by one class, (1) That death terminates man's entire being, that at death he ceases to be, his existence terminates; that no sooner does the body cease to live, than the soul is annihilated. Another class admits, (2) The continued existence of the righteous; they grant *them* an enduring immortality; but they deny the immortality or continued existence of the *wicked*. They argue that death terminates *their* being, that at death, or at the resurrection, the wicked cease to be. There is yet a third class, (3) who contend that death leaves the soul in an unconscious state, in a state of sleep and insensibility until the resurrection; that not until its re-union with the body, at the call of the Last Day, will it be invested with an active, conscious existence. According to the view of the *first* class, there is no intermediate state. According to the view of the *second* class, there is no intermediate state to the wicked; and according to the view of the *third* class, the Intermediate State is one of unconscious existence. It will be necessary to show that neither of these views is scriptural. In opposition to the first view, the Scriptures teach the *soul's immortality*. In opposition to the second view, they teach the *immortality, the continued existence* of the *wicked*,

as well as of the righteous. In opposition to the third view, they teach the *active* and *conscious* existence of the soul between death and the resurrection.

The Constituent parts of Man and their Separable and Independent Nature.

In order to gain clear and intelligent views of our subject, it will be necessary to speak of the constituent parts of man, to say something in regard to his two-fold nature. No one can fail to have observed, that there is something in man which distinguishes him from all other creatures that dwell upon earth; something that invests him with a dignity and an importance not found in any other earthly inhabitant. That which thus distinguishes man, and makes him superior to all other creatures, we call his soul, his spirit. It is this principle in man, his soul, that we pronounce immortal. *What* it is? *Where* its seat is? We cannot tell. We know it only by its operations. We know it is the seat of the *intellect*, that attribute by which man perceives, observes and acquires knowledge. We know it is the seat of the *judgment*, by which man decides the various questions that are presented to the understanding. We know it is the seat of *conscience*, by which man decides as to the moral right or wrong of actions. We know it is the seat of the *will*, by which man decides and chooses and acts, as he may be influenced by motives presented to him. We know it is the seat of the affections,—of love, of desire, of fear, of anger, and all the other emotions. These are some of the faculties, essential to the soul, and it is by the operation of these that we know it. From its operations, therefore, we know that the soul is something distinct from the body; we know it is not the body that acquires knowledge, that reasons and thinks, that loves and hates; our own consciousness assures us that it is something distinct from this, something essentially different from the body, that it is the soul.

That man has this two-fold nature, a body and a soul, and that these are distinct and separable, is clear from the teachings of the Bible. We have evidence of this fact already in the terms used to describe the original creation of man. In Genesis (1 : 27) we read: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." In the second chapter we have a more extended account of the creation of man. In Gen. 2 : 7 we have

this record: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostril the breath of life, and man became a living soul." We have here a *creation* and a *formation*. First a creation, in which there is no reference to the dust of the earth. Next a formation out of the dust of the ground. These two distinct ideas, a creation and a formation, are expressed by two different Hebrew words, the one *בָּרָא* implying an original creation, the other *יָצַק* a formation out of something that previously existed. That which was created was man as to his spiritual nature, in the image of his Creator: that which was formed, was man as to his bodily organization. This formation was at first destitute of all life—a bodily organization without vitality; subsequently God breathed into the nostrils of this fashioned, visible and yet inanimate, man the breath of life, and he became a living soul. It was the union of that which was *created* with that which was *formed*—the union of spirit and matter, that made the living man. Thus in his creation we have evidence of his two-fold nature.

That the Jews believed in this two-fold nature of man, and of the separable and independent existence of the soul, is evident from the manner in which they usually spoke of the death of their friends. They represent them as "giving up the ghost" or "spirit," as well as "dying,"—referring, no doubt, to the effect of death upon soul and body. They also represent them as being "gathered to their fathers," or "gathered to their people." (Gen. 25 : 8.) "Then Abraham *gave up the ghost* and *died* in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was *gathered to his people*." This cannot mean that his body was gathered to his ancestors, because he was buried in Machpelah, in Canaan, whilst his ancestors lived and died in Ur of the Chaldees. Terah, his father, died in Haran and was, no doubt, buried there. It cannot mean he was gathered to the dead in general, for the language is particular, that he was gathered to *his* people. It cannot mean simply that he was laid in the grave with the rest of the dead, for after, it is said, "he was gathered to his people," it is added (v. 9): "And his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him." Hence he was gathered to his people, before he was laid in the grave. The natural meaning of this passage consequently is, that after Abraham died, and before he was buried, his *soul* was gathered to *his* people who had departed this life before him. The same is said of Isaac and

Jacob and others of the Old Testament saints. Gen. 35 : 29, "And Isaac gave up the ghost and died, and was gathered unto his people, being old and full of days; and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him." Here we have the same distinct reference to the soul and body. The body was buried, but the soul, the highest and best part of his being, this was gathered to his people.

Equally definite and conclusive is the language of Solomon, (Eccl. 12 : 7): "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." We have here a distinct announcement of the two-fold nature of man, the separation and the destiny of each part.

The New Testament is, if possible, still more explicit in reference to the distinction made as to the constituent parts of man. It does not regard the body as a necessary, integral part of man; that it stands related to the spirit, merely as an earthen vessel, (2 Cor. 4 : 7) as an earthly tabernacle (2 Cor. 5 : 1) in which the spirit dwells. "Fear not them," said Jesus to his disciples, (Matt. 10 : 28) "which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Jesus knew man's nature. He here most clearly teaches that the soul is not affected by the destruction of the body—that the body might be burned, might be pierced with the sword, but no weapon could reach the soul, that it was capable of a separate existence, one independent of the body. The prayer of the dying Stephen, teaches the same truth. Looking up steadfastly into heaven, and beholding Jesus in glory, he prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit, (Acts 7 : 55—60). He understood perfectly the distinction between the soul and the body, and believed that being absent from the body, his spirit would be present with the Lord.

Many more scriptural proofs might be adduced to establish the two-fold nature of man; to show that his constituent parts are a visible body and an invisible spirit, and that the latter is capable of a separate and independent existence; but this is not necessary. The references already made are sufficient. We are now prepared to consider

The Immortality of the Soul.

Having seen that the soul is capable of a separate and independent existence, we come to show that this exist-

ence is continued throughout the Intermediate State, and will be continued forever. The Bible no where enters upon a formal proof of the soul's immortality. It deals with this question as it does with the Divine existence. It assumes it as known, and not to be proved. It is one of those great intuitive truths, which have their seat far down in the human consciousness, and which make a distinct revelation unnecessary. The belief in a continued future existence, has been almost universal. It prevailed among the most ancient nations, of whom we have any record. The Egyptians believed the doctrine long before the Israelites dwelt in their land. It was the earliest belief of the Hindoos. The Grecians recognized it, as is evident from the writings of Homer and Plato. It is at this day the belief of the millions of China and India and the isles of the sea. The Hottentot of Africa and the Indian of America alike live in the expectation of a future existence. It is a doctrine that harmonizes with the wants and desires of the human soul. The mind naturally recoils from the idea of annihilation. It longs after perpetuity of life, and seems to have an inner consciousness of it. Notwithstanding this almost universal belief of mankind, there have been those, in every age, who, Sadducee-like, have denied the existence of any hereafter to man; and what seems the more remarkable is, that among those professing this belief, are some who have a Divine Revelation and profess to base their views upon that Revelation.

Although the Sacred Scriptures do not anywhere enter upon a formal proof of man's immortality, they nevertheless frequently refer to the soul in such a way and in such terms, as leaves no doubt as to the truth of this doctrine. Some of the passages quoted to show the two-fold and separable nature of man, also prove his continued existence. The declaration of our Saviour, (Matt. 10 : 28) "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," clearly implies the continued existence of the soul after the death of the body. He would tell his disciples, that their enemies might kill the body; they might burn it at the stake, or cast it to the wild beasts, still they could not kill the soul, it would live on notwithstanding the death and destruction of the body, and so far as we have any revelation on the subject, it would live on forever. He would tell them, that what ever might happen to their bodies, their souls would be safe. This truth is

further confirmed by the prayer of the dying Stephen. As he was suffering martyrdom at the hands of the enemies of Christianity, as they were stoning him to death, he prays the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit. They were killing the body, but they could not injure the soul; their malice could not reach his nobler nature. This he commended into the hands of his Saviour, to dwell in his presence evermore. Equally explicit is the language of Jesus to the Sadducees, (Matt. 22 : 32). Moses had called Jehovah the "God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob." Jesus reproves the unbelief of the Sadducees by saying, "He is not the God of the dead but of the living." He would tell them, though Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were dead and buried, though for centuries their bodies had already dissolved into dust, still they were living; their spirits survived the dissolution of their bodies—their existence was continued. The appearance of Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration, (Matt. 17 : 3) is equally conclusive on this point. Many other passages of Scripture illustrate and establish the continued and perpetual existence of the soul. When the apostles speak of death as the "putting off of this tabernacle," as "the dissolving of the earthly house of this tabernacle;" when they represent it as "departing," as "being absent from the body," as "being unclothed," they manifestly design, by these and similar expressions, to teach the continued existence of the soul after its separation from the body by death; that the separation of one from the other does not affect their spiritual nature; that in death the body dies, but the soul still lives and will live on forever.

The Continued Existence of the Wicked as well as the Righteous.

There are some persons, who with the Bible in their hands, admit that the souls of the righteous are invested with immortality, that this is bestowed upon them because of their union with Christ, but at the same time they deny the immortality or perpetual existence of the wicked. The ground, upon which they base their opinion, in part, is the declaration of Paul (1 Tim. 6 : 16): "God only hath immortality," in connection with the promise of eternal life to believers, (Jno. 11 : 25, 26 ; 3 : 36 ; 1 Jno. 5 : 10, 11). They take the position, and it is the correct one, that no one has immortality, excepting God alone and those upon

whom he bestows it. Creatures have immortality only as they derive it from him; they are dependent upon him for this, as for every other gift. The mistake of those entertaining this view consists, in their assuming that God has not invested our entire race with an immortal, with a perpetual existence. They confound the promise of eternal life made to the righteous with the idea of perpetual existence. Because eternal life has been promised to believers and no such promise has been made to the wicked, they therefore conclude that continued existence will be the portion of believers only. Their conclusion is based upon an erroneous interpretation of the term eternal life. They suppose it to mean perpetual existence merely. The eternal life however, which is the gift of Christ, and which is promised to all believers, is something very different from perpetual existence. It, of course, involves this, but it includes vastly more. It embraces all the glory and blessedness which are connected with the heavenly state. The wicked will never inherit *eternal life*, but an eternal existence will most assuredly be theirs—from this they cannot escape.

The terms Death, Destruction, &c., applied to the Wicked, do not signify a ceasing to be.

The opinion of the destruction or annihilation of the wicked, is further based upon the terms which are employed in the Scriptures in speaking of their death. The Scriptures threaten the wicked, not only with death (Rom. 6 : 23), but also with "destruction" (1 Tim. 6 : 9), "perdition" (Heb. 10 : 39), and "corruption" (2 Pet. 2 : 12). They declare that sinners shall be "burned up" (Ps. 97 : 3; Rom. 6 : 8; Matt. 3 : 12), "consumed" (2 Thess. 2 : 8), "hewn down" (Matt. 7 : 19), "cut off" (Mal. 2 : 12), "devoured" (Heb. 10 : 27), "ground to powder" (Luke 20 : 18), "blotted out" (Ps. 69 : 28), and the like terms. They also assert that they "shall not live" (Ezek. 18 : 13), they "shall die" (Ezek. 18 : 4), "shall be devoured by fire" (Ezek. 23 : 25), "shall be burned up root and branch" (Mal. 4 : 1), and "be as though they had not been" (Obad. 16). Because these and like terms are used, in speaking of the death of the wicked, Annihilationists assume that they will cease to be, as these terms involve a cessation of being. This, however, is an assumption that cannot be maintained. In

all these expressions, reference is chiefly to the body, to that part of man which is visible, and does not relate to the invisible part, the soul. The sacred writers speak of man as he appears to them, and, consequently, they do not by these terms, in any case, teach a ceasing of man's existence, a destruction or annihilation of his two-fold being.

These terms are used by the sacred writers with the same signification that we now use them. We constantly hear persons speak of the departed as "having died" and "were buried—"as having returned to the dust," as "being suddenly cut off" and "existing no more." We read, in the publications of the day, of men "having perished" in the flames or in the flood; of "having been destroyed" by the pestilence, of having been "annihilated" in battle, of whole families having been "burned up root and branch," and when we hear and read these, and similar expressions, we do not, for a moment, suppose that these persons ceased to be entirely,—that they passed entirely out of existence. The speakers and writers themselves had attached no such meaning to the terms they used. They used the terms with reference to man's bodily organization, and at the same time firmly believed in man's continued existence in another state of being. The Bible treats the subject of death in the same way. It uses the popular language of appearance, and the terms employed in reference to the departed dead, no more signify annihilation, or a ceasing to be, than the terms death, destruction, &c., as now used, mean the same thing.

There is an analogy between the death of the body and the death of the soul, yet, when the term death is applied to the soul, it implies something very different from a ceasing to be. The natural state of man is invariably represented in the Scriptures as one of death. This was the immediate consequence of his transgression. To Adam it was said: "In the *day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," (Gen. 2 : 17). "On the very day of his transgression death began to work, in both his body and soul, steadily conducting the one to the dust, whence it was taken, and making the other continually more and more a vessel of wrath, fitted for destruction."

So truly dead is man in his natural state, that he "must be born again," before he can have life. Until he receives Christ by faith, he is represented as having no life in him. He is "alienated from the life of God." He must "pass

from death unto life," or his existence will end in eternal death. The soul that is dead, is justly represented as "out of the sphere of true life. It has no practical and proper recognition of God; no sensibility to his true character, no communion with him. The soul that is dead is as indifferent to the things which constitute the true life and glory of God, as a dead man is to the things which occupy the living. It does not know God." From all this it is very manifest that, whilst there is an analogy between the death of the body and the soul, there is still a great difference—the body dies, it becomes inanimate, cold, decays and is buried out of sight. It is separated from the living. The death of the soul, however, is a living death. "I know that thou livest and art dead, (Rev. 3 : 1). It is a state of separation and alienation from God, which is commenced here, and continued throughout eternity, if the soul be not born again in the present life. When this alienation is continued into the eternal world, it is called eternal death.

That the soul, the spiritual part of the wicked, also continues after death, is clearly indicated in the Scriptures. Dives, who died and was buried, did not cease to be at death, for we are told, that "in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torment." Though his body was upon earth—was being consigned to the dust—still his soul existed, and he declares, "I am tormented in this flame." There are numerous passages which, by their very terms, preclude the idea of the annihilation of the wicked at death, or at any other period. For example, it is said, "the wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness;" this takes place after death. They "shall be turned into hell." They "shall go away into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angel." They "shall go away into everlasting punishment;" "dwell with everlasting burnings;" "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." They are to "rise to shame and everlasting contempt." These passages, and many others, necessarily imply continued existence, some of them perpetual existence. There are other passages still more direct on this point; passages which not only imply existence in general, but specify individuals who survive in the world of spirits. We have the case of the wicked Antediluvians. The apostle Peter (1 Pet. 3 : 20) speaks of them more than two thousand years after their death, as being "in prison," in connection

with the fallen spirits that kept not their first estate. We have the case of Judas, who it is said (Acts 1 : 25) "went to his own place," and this place of such a nature, "that it were better for him that he had never been born," (Matt. 26 : 24). In reference to those on the left hand of the Judge, it is said, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," (Matt. 25 : 46).

These references might be multiplied, but we deem it unnecessary, as those already presented are sufficient to establish beyond controversy the continued and perpetual existence of the wicked, as well as the righteous.

The Intermediate State, one of Active, Conscious Existence.

As death does not terminate man's being, as the existence of the righteous and wicked is continued during the Intermediate State, the next inquiry has reference to the state of the soul during this period. Is it a state of insensibility? Of unconscious repose? Is it a state, in which the faculties of the soul are entirely suspended, so as to render it incapable of action, or enjoyment or suffering? Or does the soul, separated from the body, exist in a state of consciousness and activity, and sensibility to pleasure and pain?

The Sacred Scriptures are claimed by some as teaching an intervening state of sleep or unconsciousness. The advocates of this doctrine rely chiefly upon the expressions "sleep" or "asleep," as applied to death in the Bible. They say: "It is singular that the word *"sleep"* should be used for an active, conscious condition. It should rather denote a state of profound insensibility, in which the disembodied soul, deprived of the means of manifestation, remains wrapped in slumber." There would be some force in this argument, if the Scriptures were singular in this use of the term. This, however, we find not to be the case. Men, who believe in the consciousness of the soul after death, speak frequently of the dying, as "falling asleep," and of the dead, as "having fallen asleep." This has been the custom for ages, and those, who used these terms in this sense, never perceived any impropriety in their language. How very common it is to speak of the dead, as *having fallen asleep*, as *sleeping in Jesus*, as *sleeping in the grave*. And yet when we speak thus, we do not, for a moment, suppose that the soul of the person to whom we refer, is in an unconscious state. By no means. We

refer to the body, and precisely so the sacred writers. They use the term sleep in the same sense—as referring to the body, and not as affecting the soul. It is said of Stephen, after having commended his *spirit* to the Lord Jesus, “he fell asleep,” or, in other words, “he died.” The sacred historian here clearly distinguishes between the destiny of the body and the spirit. The spirit wings its way into the presence of Jesus, whilst the body sleeps the sleep of death—that sleep, which experiences no awakening until the morning of the resurrection. St. Matthew (27 : 52), also, recognizes this distinction with great clearness. “Many *bodies* of the saints which slept arose;” and Paul, in like manner (1 Cor. 15 : 20), when he says, “Christ is become the first fruits of them that slept.” There is, in both these passages, a manifest reference to the resurrection of the body. The bodies spoken of as arising, are those that slept in the grave. No reference whatever is made to their souls. The same is true of all those passages of Scripture, where the term sleep necessarily means an unconscious state. They invariably refer to the body, and not to the soul. Thus Job (7 : 2) refers to his bodily organization, when speaking of his death, he says: “For now shall I sleep in the dust.” So, also, Daniel refers to the body, when he says: “Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” (Dan. 12 : 2). All this is confirmed by the language of our Saviour, when he speaks to his disciples in reference to the death of Lazarus, (Jno. 11 : 11—14).

But even admitting that there is an analogy between death and sleep, that there is a resemblance between these two states,—this by no means proves that the soul is unconscious in the sleep of death. On the contrary, it favors the idea of the continued active and conscious state of the soul. It never yet has been proved, that the soul is unconscious even in natural sleep. On the contrary, it is most generally believed, that the mind does not cease to think and to be active, in the profoundest sleep. The activity of the soul in sleep, as well as its capability of enjoying pleasure and suffering pain without the body, are clearly seen in that state we call dreaming. Persons in this state are aware of existing, of thinking, of moving and acting, though their bodies were motionless and without sensation. In this state they have made journeys, which seemed as real as any they made, whilst awake, and

yet they were all the time upon their bed, and never moved a limb. In this state they have conversed with friends, though their lips never moved and their tongue was silent. In this state they have had sensations of pleasure and pain, without the body being in any way affected. Sleep and death resemble each other, not because the soul is unconscious in either state, but because the bodily senses are closed, because the channel by which the spirit looks out upon the world, and by which the world approaches the spirit—these lie dormant. The soul is, no doubt, always active—the body alone rests in sleep. It is the senses, the nerves, the organs of the soul for the present life, which are directly concerned in sleep, and just so it is in death. The body sleeps in the dust of the earth until the Last Day, but the soul is not there; it has passed into a different sphere of activity and consciousness. The truth of this is confirmed by the apostle Paul, (1 Thess. 5 : 9, 10): “For God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we *wake* or *sleep*, we should live together with him.” The apostle here evidently refers to life and death. He would say, that Christ died for Christians, that whether living or dead, they should be together with the Lord; that even in death they should have a vivid consciousness of their union with Christ, they should still live with him; the soul would still be possessed of an active, living consciousness. On another occasion, the same apostle says, (2 Cor. 5 : 6—8): “We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord.” Death, in his estimation, would be absence from the body, but it would not leave him in a state of unconscious existence; on the contrary, it would be an immediate admittance into the presence of the Lord, which he esteemed as “far better” (Phil. 1 : 23) than sojourning upon earth. Had the apostle believed that a long interval of unconsciousness would succeed his death, he would not have used such language. He regarded death as gain, because simultaneously with his earthly dissolution, he was sure of the attainment of the rewards of the blessedness of heaven. Paul no where favors the idea of a future unconscious state of existence; and the whole Bible is in harmony with his teachings. Its writers did not, for a moment, suppose that they would have to lie for thousands of years in an unconscious state. David says: “In thy pres-

ence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures forever more." "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory, (Ps. 16 : 11 ; 73 : 24). His expectation was, immediately upon his death, to be received up into glory, to where, there is fulness of joy, and pleasures forever. Christ, quoting from the Pentateuch the passage, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob," (Ex. 3 : 6) confounded the Sadducees by adding, "God is not the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*," (Matt. 22 : 32); words which are directly opposed to the idea of an unconscious intermediate state. The appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration, is a conclusive proof of the active conscious existence of the soul, (Matt. 17 : 2). We see them here in a state of blessed intercourse and enjoyment.

That the state of the wicked after death, is also one of consciousness and activity, is implied in what we have already stated. But we have still further evidence on this point. Peter (1st Epist. 3 : 18) speaks of the wicked Antediluvians as sustaining a conscious existence, in prison, in connection with fallen spirits, reserved under darkness unto the Judgment of the Great Day, more than twenty centuries after they were overwhelmed in the deluge of waters. Our Lord's narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, teaches beyond a doubt, the active, conscious existence of the wicked in the Intermediate State, as well as the righteous, (Luke 16 : 19—31). The testimony of our Saviour is not weakened by supposing his words to be a parable. "No amount of ingenuity, no keenness of spiritual vision, can invalidate the facts *it* sets forth in regard to man's future state. After every attempt to explain it away, it will still remain perfectly plain, that our Lord intended it to apply to the condition of men's souls after death." On the strength of this narrative, we may assert without any hesitancy, that, immediately after death and previous to the resurrection, the impenitent dead are fully conscious, are in a state of suffering without any prospect of relief. The facts introduced in the narrative, are represented as taking place during the Intermediate State, after death and before the judgment, for the rich man had brothers still living upon earth. That in this state he was in the full possession of consciousness, is evident from the whole narrative, but especially from his ability to remember—he remembered his five brethren; to know—he recognized Abra-

ham and Lazarus afar off; and to feel, for he confesses, "I am tormented in this flame.

It must follow from all this, that the condition of the departed dead is one of full consciousness and activity, that this is true of both the righteous and the wicked in the Intermediate State. We regard this as an established truth—one clearly taught in the volume of Inspiration.

The Place of the Departed during the Intermediate State.

If the souls of the departed are in an active, conscious state, as we have shown, then there must be some place prepared for them, in which to exercise their activities. "Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" (Job 14: 10). After he takes his departure from earth, where does he sojourn? What is the nature and place of his abode? If we were without a Divine Revelation to enlighten us on this point, we could know nothing with certainty in regard to our future dwelling place, all would be enveloped in darkness and in doubt. We, in all probability, would have some notions on the subject, but like those of the nations of the world, who are without the Bible, they would be crude and unsatisfactory. We might, perhaps, with many of the nations of the Eastern world, have believed in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls—the passage of the soul at death into another bodily organism, of a higher or lower order, according as the life had been good or evil; or we might have supposed, with the Egyptians, that the soul after death still dwelt near the body and lingered around its grave; or we might have embraced the idea entertained by many heathen minds, that the souls of the departed still mingled with the living, and were cognizant of their actions, or that they wandered to some far off planet, there to pass through another stage of being. But we have not been left to the uncertainties of mere conjecture, or the inventions of our own fancy, on this interesting point. We have a revelation, which expels the darkness that hangs around the subject, and discloses the soul's future dwelling place. What then is the scriptural idea on this subject? What does the Bible teach in regard to the place of the departed dead? Whither do the spirits of men go after death? Is there an intermediate place, which is neither heaven nor hell? Or is there a common abode for all, embracing an inferior heaven and hell? Or

do they at once enter upon their final dwelling place—the heaven and hell of the Scriptures, clearly revealed?

No Intermediate Place for the Departed Spirit.

The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is set forth on this point in the following questions and answers, contained in one of their Catechisms,* “*What becomes of the soul, when it leaves the body?*” It appears before the tribunal of Jesus Christ, to give account of its works in the body. *Whither do souls go, after this particular judgment?* Some to heaven, some to purgatory, and some to hell. Such as die innocent, or are free from even the smallest debt to the justice of God, go immediately to heaven. Those who die owing anything to God’s justice, go to purgatory, there to suffer, until they have satisfied the justice of God, when they too will be taken to heaven. This place will exist only until the second coming of Christ. Finally, those who die in mortal sin go immediately to hell, from which there is no escape.” In regard to purgatory, we are not told where it is? nor what the nature of its pains are? nor how long each soul is detained there? The Romanist is taught to believe, that those who are in this place are relieved by the prayers of their fellow members here on earth, as also by alms and masses offered up to God for their souls.

This doctrine of purgatory is based chiefly upon the teachings of the Apocraphal writings. Revelation gives it no countenance. But four passages of Scripture are adduced to sustain it, namely, Matt. 5 : 25, 26; 12 : 32; 1 Cor. 3 : 13—15, and 1 Pet. 3 : 19. And these, after being tortured and wrested from their true meaning, give it but a doubtful support; correctly interpreted they afford it no favor whatever. Who, without a theory to support, would find a purgatory in the *prison*, mentioned by our Lord, from which the debtor should not escape until he had “paid the uttermost farthing?” Who, free from any bias, would conclude, because our Saviour said the sin against the Holy Ghost shall be forgiven “neither in this world, nor in the world to come,” that there is such a place as purgatory, where forgiveness of other sins might be obtained, and not rather understand Matthew, as explained

* Keenan’s Cat. of the Christian Religion.

by Mark and Luke, that this kind of blasphemy shall never be forgiven? Or who, not prejudiced by previous teachings, would suppose that the apostle Paul referred to the fires of purgatory, when he taught the Christians at Corinth, that "If any man's works shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet as by fire." Or that Peter wrote in favor of purgatory, when he penned the words found in the third chapter of his First Epistle. We shall have occasion, in another connection, to refer to this passage, and also to show the unscripturalness of the whole idea of purgatory. We would here only add the testimony of one who has given this subject much careful study, and is, consequently, qualified to speak without hesitation. Speaking of purgatory Dr. Edgar* says: "Revelation affords it no countenance. No other dogma of Romanism, except image worship and the invocation of saints, seems to borrow so little support from the Book of Inspiration. The Bible, by certain management and dexterity, may appear to lend some encouragement to transubstantiation and extreme unction. But the ingenuity of man has never been able to discover a single argument for a middle place of purification, possessing even a shadow of plausibility. The name itself is not in all the sacred volume, and the attempts which have been made to find the tenet in its inspired contents, have only shown the fatuity of the authors. The Book of God, on these occasions, has been uniformly tortured, for the purpose of extorting acknowledgments, of which it is guiltless, and which, without compulsion, it would obstinately deny. * * * None of the ancients, for four hundred years after the Christian era, mention any such place. * * * Many of the fathers testify, in the plainest language, against an intermediate state of expiation. * * * Augustine, while he owns a heaven and a hell, rejects, in unqualified and emphatical language, 'the idea of a third place, as unknown to the Church and foreign to the Sacred Scriptures.' Ephraim, disclaims, in the clearest terms, the belief of a middle place. 'To avoid hell, is,' he avers, 'to obtain heaven, and to miss heaven, is to enter hell.'"

* Variations of Popery.

No Common Receptacle of the Dead, embracing an Inferior Heaven and Hell.

A number of able and distinguished writers advocate the idea of a common receptacle of the dead, divided into two apartments, the one the abode of the pious, during the Intermediate State, the other, the abode of the wicked. An inferior heaven and hell. They understand the Hebrew word שְׁאוֹל (Sheol), and the Greek word ᾠδης (Hades), as indicating such a common receptacle. This seems to have been the belief of many of the early fathers. It also prevailed among the Reformers. We find it still maintained by eminent lexicographers and commentators.

Dr. Holmes, of England, in an Article on "Hell," in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia, says: "*Sheol* is the receptacle of the spirits of *all* that depart this life. It is the abode of the wicked, and the good." * * "There is in *Hades* of the New Testament," he adds, "an equally ample signification with the *Sheol* of the Old Testament, as the abode of both happy and miserable beings. * * As might be expected, there is more plainly indicated in the New Testament, the *separate* condition of the righteous and the wicked; to indicate this separation, other terms are used; thus, in Luke 23 : 43, paradise is used to describe that part of *Hades* which the blessed dead inhabit. * * Another figurative expression, used to designate the happy part of *Hades*, is 'Abraham's bosom.' The paradise referred to in Luke 23 : 43, is, no doubt, different from that of St. Paul, 2 Cor. 12 : 4, which is designated in Rev. 2 : 7, ὁ παραδεισος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the supernal Paradise." The writer adds, in a foot note: "The distinction between the upper and the lower paradise, was familiar to the Jews."

Dr. Robinson, in his Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, says, under *Hades*: "No distinction of place is indicated, in the *Sheol* of the Old Testament, between the righteous and the wicked. * * The idea of *Sheol* is found, among the later Jews, more developed and assimilated to the Greek *Hades*. The souls of the righteous and the wicked were held to be separated; the former inhabiting the region of the blessed, the inferior paradise, (Luke 23 : 43); while lower down was the abyss, called *Gehenna* or *Tartarus*, in which the souls of the wicked are in torment." Under the word παραδεισος, he says: "Para-

dise is put for the abode of the blessed, after death, viz.: (1.) The inferior paradise, or region of the blessed, in *Hades*, (Luke 23 : 43). (2.) The paradise of God, the celestial paradise, where the spirits of the just dwell with God, (2 Cor. 12 : 4).

Dr. Lange, of the University of Bonn, in his comments on Matthew 11 : 23, says:* "The Greek word *Hades*, is equivalent to, though not quite identical with, the Hebrew *Sheol*. * * The essential ideas attached to *Hades*, are: (1) Habitation of the dead, before the completion of Redemption; (2) Contrast between the higher and lower region, between the place of rest and that of torment, Luke 16 : 19—31; (3) State of imperfectness of the souls in *Hades*—disembodied state, longing, waiting for final decision, 1 Pet. 3 : 19; (4) Continuance as an intermediate kingdom, till the end of the world."

Dr. Van Oosterzee, of the University of Utrecht,† in commenting upon Luke 16 : 22, 23, represents *Hades* as a "general designation of the abode of departed spirits." He regards Abraham's bosom, as "a metaphorical expression of the blessedness which, immediately after death, was prepared for pious Israelites, in common with their blessed ancestor, (Jno. 8 : 56). In all probability the expression is synonymous with paradise, (Luke 33 : 43). In *Sheol*, the general appellation for the abode of departed spirits, the Jews, as is known, distinguish, on the one hand, a place of punishment, Gehenna; on the other hand, Paradise, for the pious. We have to understand the rich man as being in the former; Lazarus, as being in the latter." * * "Paradise, which is here spoken of as the destined place of the blessed, must be carefully distinguished from the third heaven, 2 Cor. 12 : 4, the dwelling place of the perfected righteous. The paradise is, on the other hand, in the intermediate state, a place of incipient, although very refreshing rest, in which the Jews conceived all the saints of the Old Testament as united in joy."

Dr. Schaff, in his Catechism for Sunday Schools and Families, says: "*Hades*, i. e., the region of the dead, or the underworld, is the abode of all the departed, both the righteous and the wicked, and corresponds to the Hebrew *Sheol*." In answer to the question, "Where was the soul of

* Crit. Doct. and Hom. Commentary, by J. P. Lange, D. D.

† Lange's Commentary on Luke.

Christ, while his body rested in the grave?" he says: "He descended into *Hades*; that is, the lower world, or the region of the dead," and gives as proof passages, Luke 23 : 43; Acts 2 : 31, &c. Dr. Mombert, of Lancaster, Pa, says: "In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Christ represents the soul of Dives in hell, and that of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. * * Both are in the same *general* abode, but in separate regions. * * *Hades* and Abraham's bosom, designate not a final, but an *intermediate* abode." Again, "Our Lord's promise to the dying malefactor, 'Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise,' Luke 23 : 43, plainly shows, that paradise is not heaven, for Christ did not go from the cross to heaven, but his body was laid into the tomb, and his soul went to hell or *Hades*. The soul of the malefactor, therefore, went, not to heaven, but to *Hades* or Paradise." And again: "*Hades* is to the souls of the righteous, a state and place of partial bliss, and, to the wicked, a state and place of partial misery, destined, in either case, to be perfected and consummated respectively, into the absolute bliss of heaven, and the absolute misery of hell (*Gehenna*)."

The writers quoted, generally argue upon the following points: (1) That there is a *common* or *general* receptacle of *all* the dead, which is neither heaven nor hell, but an intermediate place, called *Hades*. (2) That this common receptacle, or intermediate place, is divided into two apartments, the one for the righteous and the other for the wicked. (3) That the part of *Hades*, which the righteous dead inhabit, is called "Abraham's bosom," and also "paradise," which they call an *inferior* or *lower* paradise, to distinguish it from the celestial paradise. (4) That to the blessed dead, this *Hades*, this intermediate place, this paradise, is a place of "incipient, although very refreshing, rest," "a state of imperfectness of souls, longing, waiting for final decision;" "a state and place of partial bliss, destined to be perfected and consummated into the absolute bliss of heaven."

Now it is with these views that we join issue. We do not believe them to be scriptural. We do not believe that the Bible teaches a common receptacle of the righteous and the wicked, beyond death and the grave. We do not believe in a lower or inferior paradise, as the abode of the righteous during the Intermediate State; or in a lower

* *Evangelical Review*, Vol. 17 : 4.

or inferior hell, as the abode of the wicked, during the same period. We do not believe that any imperfection clings to the souls of the righteous that would unfit them for heaven, or any want of guilt attaches to the wicked at once to consign them to hell. On the contrary, we believe that the Sacred Scriptures clearly teach that there are two separate and distinct places in the future world, and only two; that these are the final and everlasting dwelling places of the righteous and the wicked respectively. The one is heaven, the home of the blessed. It is also called paradise, the Third Heaven, Abraham's bosom, &c. The other place is hell, the abode of the lost. The terms *Hades*, *Gehenna*, lake of fire, furnace of fire, &c., are also applied to this place. The only distinction to be made in regard to these terms, is, that whilst *Gehenna*, lake of fire, &c., always denote a place of future punishment, *Hades* sometimes refers to the grave, and is so used.

We have three terms in the original Scriptures, chiefly used to designate the mysteries of hell; viz.: *Sheol*, *Hades* and *Gehenna*. In regard to the last term, there is no controversy. *Gehenna* occurs twelve times in the New Testament, (Matt. 5 : 22, 29, 30; 10 : 28; 18 : 9; 23 : 15, 33; Mark 9 : 43, 45, 47; Luke 12 : 5; James 3 : 6), and is regarded as being correctly translated *hell*, and as referring to a place of future punishment. *Sheol* and *Hades*, are claimed as designating an indiscriminate abode of the righteous and the wicked, during the Intermediate State, but, we think, without just reason. We are very decided in our conviction that these terms do not justify such a reference; that when they are so used as to apply, both to the righteous and the wicked, they have no reference to a future abode at all, but to the grave, used in a general sense, or to death as the appointed destiny of all men. We regard the Universalist, who applies these terms, *in every instance*, to the grave, and his opponent, who makes them refer, *at all times*, to a place of future punishment, as equally in error. They do sometimes signify the grave, but when a future abode is indicated, they are never used in a good sense. The derivation and early use of these terms, do not necessarily decide this question, for it is well known that words change their meaning in the progress of time; and even at the same period, have distinct significations.

The word *Sheol*, occurs sixty-five times in the Old Testa-

ment. In the Septuagint version, it is rendered *Hades* sixty-one times; *Thanatos*, twice (2 Sam. 22 : 6; Prov. 23 : 14), and twice it is omitted in the common text, (Job 24 : 9; Ezek. 32 : 21). In our authorized Version, it is translated *grave*, thirty-one times; *hell*, thirty-one times; and thrice, *pit*.^{*} In many instances, in which it is otherwise rendered, *Sheol* means the *grave*. This is its most general meaning. Sometimes it must be understood as referring to *death*, or a *state of death*. It is thus used by Jacob (Gen. 37 : 35): "I will go down into *Sheol*, unto my son, mourning," *i. e.*, I will die with grief, I will never leave mourning till I die. Sometimes it is *placed in contrast with heaven* (Ps. 139 : 8): "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in *Sheol*, thou art there." At other times, it clearly *implies a place of extreme suffering* (Ps. 9 : 17): "The wicked shall be turned into *Sheol*, and all the nations that forget God." (Amos 9 : 3): "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn to the lowest *Sheol*." As a *place*, it is described as *very deep* (Job 11 : 8); *dark* (Job 10 : 21, 22); with *valleys* or *depths* (Ps. 86 : 13); with *bars and gates* (Job 17 : 16; Isa. 38 : 10); and *situated beneath us*.

In no instance does the word express any thing desirable. There is nothing in its use, to indicate that it ever refers to the home of the blessed dead. On the contrary, it invariably signifies something repulsive, and is clearly indicated as the abode of the wicked. The whole subject will be divested of much difficulty, if we bear in mind, that *Sheol*, signifying the grave, or a state of death, may be applied to the righteous and wicked, indiscriminately; but when it denotes a place of abode, in the future world, it can be applied to the wicked only, and is equivalent to *Gehenna*.

Dr. Holmes† gives as proof passages, to sustain the opinion that *Sheol* is the receptacle of the spirits of *all* that depart this life, Psalm 89 : 47, 48; and Isa. 38 : 18, 19; and to sustain the view that it is also the abode of the good, he quotes, Ps. 16 : 10 comp. with Acts 2 : 27, 31; Ps. 30 : 3; 49 : 15; 86 : 13; Isa. 38 : 10 comp. with Job 3 : 17—19; Hos. 13 : 14 comp. with 1 Cor. 15 : 55.

That these passages do not sustain the views here

^{*} Kitto.

[†] Kitto: Cyclopædia, Vol. 2 : 273.

claimed, we shall show in connection with our discussion of *Hades*, which is claimed as being of nearly similar import.

Of the eleven passages in which *Hades* occurs in the New Testament, there is not one, we think, which necessarily implies a future common residence of the righteous and the wicked; not one that clearly indicates this. In 1 Cor. 15 : 55, it denotes the *grave*, and is so rendered. We think it should have been translated *grave* also in Acts 2 : 27, 31; Rev. 6 : 8; and 20 : 13, 14. In the other instances of its occurrence, Matt. 11 : 23; 16 : 18; Luke 10 : 15; 16 : 23, and Rev. 1 : 18, it is correctly translated *hell*, and is equivalent to *Gehenna*, the place of future punishment.

The great argument in favor of a common receptacle of the dead, of an intermediate place, embracing an inferior paradise, and an imperfectly developed *Gehenna*, is the Article of Christ's descent into hell, the *Descensus ad Inferos*, which has found its way into almost all the Confessions of Christendom. It is contained in two of the three Ecumenical Creeds adopted by our Church, viz., the Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds. It is also found in the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Smaller and Larger Catechisms, and the Formula Concordiæ.

To harmonize the Scriptures to this Article of the Creeds, has led to the idea of a common receptacle of all the dead, during the Intermediate State; it has led to the creation of an intermediate place, embracing an inferior Paradise and *Gehenna*; and it has occasioned many of those errors, that have arisen in connection with man's future existence.

The fact, that this Article is found in almost all the Symbols of Christendom, that it is repeated, again and again, in our Confessions of faith, does not necessarily bind it upon our belief. The real question is, *Is it found in the Bible?* If there, we must receive it; if not there, we must reject it.

We do not believe that this Article, as usually received, is in the Bible, and hence, we do not regard ourselves as bound by it. If we are to understand by *Christ's descent into hell*, merely that he truly died, and that whilst his body was in the grave, his soul was with God, in the heavenly paradise, then we receive it, but we regard the words chosen to express this idea as unfortunate. But

when we are required to believe that it teaches something different from this, that it teaches a real descent to *Hades*, whether to the portion of it occupied by the blessed dead, or by the lost, we reject it, because we believe it unscriptural.

The fact that this Article had no place in the Creeds of the Christian Church for above four centuries, that when first introduced, it was equivalent to the burial of Christ, and supplied the place of the word "buried," may well lead us to question the scripturalness of the Article, as generally interpreted. Another point that may cause us to question its credibility, is the great variety of interpretations attached to the passage of Scripture, supposed to teach it.

The passages, which are supposed to teach Christ's descent to hell, and upon which chiefly is built the idea of an intermediate place, which is neither heaven nor hell, are the following: (1) Ps. 16 : 10, quoted by Peter; Acts 2 : 27, 31; and by Paul, Acts 13 : 35. (2) Eph. 4 : 8—10. (3) 1 Pet. 3 : 18—20. We think these passages, correctly interpreted, teach no such doctrine as is claimed. A presentation of the various interpretations of these passages, would extend our article to too great a length. We shall state merely what we regard as their true meaning.

1. *The Psalmist, as quoted by Peter and Paul.* "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *Sheol* (hell), neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (Ps. 16 : 10). The latter part of this passage is easily understood. It evidently is a prophecy, and means, that the *body* of Christ should not see corruption; that, in this respect, he would differ from David, and mankind generally. The only points of difficulty are: (1) The meaning of "my soul," as used in this connection; and, (2) the meaning of *Sheol* (hell). We regard this as one of the passages, in which *Sheol* should have been translated *grave*. This will appear as soon as we shall have determined the true meaning of "my soul." Does this refer to the human soul of Christ, or may it be otherwise understood? We do not think that it has such a reference. We understand it as signifying the *person*, and is equivalent to "me," "my body," "my person." •The two clauses are, no doubt, synonymous, and the passage simply means, "Thou wilt not

leave *me* (my body) in the grave, neither wilt thou suffer *me* to become subject to corruption."

Starke* says: "Soul here means, not the spirit, but the person, with reference to the body," and he paraphrases the passage, as follows: "My Heavenly Father will not leave my soul, *my body, which laid aside its natural life at the cross in hell, in death and in the grave.*"

Dr. Scott† says: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" is explained, according to the Hebrew idiom, by the corresponding clause, "neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," that is, thou wilt not leave *me* under the power of death. Here *soul* is put for person, and *Sheol*, or *Hades*, for the grave." This, we may remark, is not an unusual rendering of the expression *soul, my soul, &c.* The Hebrew word thus rendered, is *Nephesch* and was often used to denote the whole person. Hence the rendering adopted is not peculiar. Numb. 23 : 10: "Let me, my soul (*Nepheschi*), die the death of the righteous." Judges 16 : 30: "And Sampson said, Let my soul (*Nepheschi*) die with the Philistine." "Gen. 37 : 21: "Let us not kill him," (*Naphesch*). Josh. 10 : 39: "And utterly destroyed all the souls (*Nephesch*) that were therein," *i. e.*, all the persons therein. By remembering these two facts, that *Nephesch*, often rendered *soul*, means the person with reference to the body; and that *Sheol* frequently means the grave when otherwise translated, we will have a key that will unlock those passages, which are supposed to teach a common receptacle of the spirits of the departed. It will appear that the grave is the common receptacle referred to, and that no distinct affirmation is made in regard to their souls.

The language of Peter and Paul (Acts 2 : 27 and 13 : 35) is in perfect accord with this interpretation of the prophecy. They refer to this prophecy to prove the Messiahship of Jesus; they show that the resurrection of the Messiah was the subject of prophecy; and that, as Jesus rose from the dead without experiencing corruption, therefore he was the Messiah. The point of their argument lies clearly in the miracle of the resurrection. Paul does not even quote the first part of the passage. His omission of the words, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in

* Synopsis Bibliothecæ Exegeticæ.

† The Christ of the Apostles' Creed.

Hades," is indirect proof, that there is no important truth contained in them, aside and different from what is expressed by the words "neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." It is evident that Peter also uses the term *soul* in the sense of person, and *Hades* for the grave; and makes the last clause explanatory of the first.

There is here, consequently, no proof of a *descensus ad inferos*; no evidence that Christ went down to *Hades*, that imaginary realm of all departed spirits; no intimation that he abode in the paradise of the blessed dead, or in the *gehenna* of the lost. So far as these passages are concerned, we have no information as to where the soul of Christ was, between his death and resurrection.

2. The second passage, usually adduced to favor the doctrine of Christ's descent to hell, is Eph. 4 : 8—10.

As *Hades* was supposed to be situated beneath the earth, or in the lower parts of the earth, the opinion has been maintained that the apostle, in this passage, teaches Christ's descent to hell. It has often been quoted in support of this doctrine, but without good reason. The apostle does not assert that Christ descended, *after* his death, into hell. The opposite is certainly indicated. There is no evidence that the apostle means the place of departed souls, in any sense, by the expression, "the lowest parts of the earth." These words are expressive of his humiliation. Heaven and earth are opposed to each other. One is above; the other is beneath. From the one Christ descended to the other; and he came not only to the earth, but he stooped to the most humble condition of humanity here. There is, consequently, no support to the doctrine of Christ's descent to hell. We have a reference to the incarnation of Jesus, including his entire mediatorial work on earth, his ascension to heaven, and his final triumph, nothing in favor of the *Descensus ad Inferos*.

3. It yet remains to consider 1 Pet. 3 : 18—20. Of this passage we have two leading interpretations, differing vastly in the conclusions reached. (1) The advocates of a literal and local descent of Christ to hell claim, that this passage teaches, *that, between his death and resurrection, Christ went down to Hades in person, and preached to the disembodied spirits there, especially to the disobedient Antediluvians.* They differ, as to whether it was his soul only; or his Divinity only; or whether it was both his soul and body, that descended? They differ also as to whether it

was to the *happy*, the paradisiacal part of *Hades*, or to the unhappy, the *gehennaen* part, to which he made the descent? They differ further, as to the object of the descent. Whether it was to proclaim his complete triumph to his friends; or to friends and foes? Whether it was to deliver the Old Testament saints from those gloomy and shadowy realms, to which they had been consigned? Or, whether it was to make new offers of mercy to those, who on earth remained disobedient? It seems to us to follow, that, if this passage teaches Christ's literal descent to *Hades*, it clearly teaches his descent to the abode of the wicked; and also, that his preaching was to the impenitent dead, wherein is implied further offers of mercy. And this is the conclusion reached by many who have embraced the doctrine of a local descent. "Sound exegesis," says a writer in the *Evangelical Review*, (Vol. 17: 13) "clearly establishes the apostolic declaration, that our Lord Jesus Christ, after his crucifixion, went, in spirit, to the place of departed spirits (*Hades*, *Sheol* as in the Syriac), and there preached to those spirits, who, in the days of Noah, during the building of the Ark, persisted in unbelief and disobedience." The conclusion reached is: "If such mercy was shown to the hardened impenitents of the day of Noah, that the Son of God visited them in the gloomy prison of the spirit-world, and preached to them the gospel, may we not cherish the hope, that similar mercy may be shown to the untold millions, who, without any fault of theirs, die in heathen or Mohammedan countries, beyond the reach and influence of the gospel?"

We regard this hope of the writer, as the legitimate conclusion of his interpretation; only that we can see no reason for the limitation of the offers of mercy to those who, without any fault of theirs, die beyond the reach and influence of the gospel. This limitation is not justified by the facts in the case. Those, to whom Christ is supposed to have preached in hell, did not die beyond the reach of such influence. Noah was a "preacher of righteousness," and, no doubt, faithfully fulfilled his mission as such, yet his cotemperaries remained disobedient. If, then, there is mercy in store for *these*, where shall be its limit?

If we interpret this passage, as signifying a literal descent of Christ to hell to preach the gospel (*εὐαγγέλιον*) to the spirits of the wicked Antediluvians, it opens the door to a multitude of conjectures and gives some countenance to

those errors that have arisen in regard to the future of the impenitent dead. In view of this, we may well ask, is this the meaning of this passage? Is it the true interpretation? We think not.

2. The other leading interpretation, the one we regard as coming nearest the truth, teaches, *that the spirit spoken of by the apostle, was the Holy Spirit, and not the human soul of Christ; that the preaching was, through the instrumentality of Noah whom Christ had inspired by his Spirit to preach to his cotemporaries, and that these, notwithstanding Noah's preaching, remained disobedient, impenitent, and were, at the time when Peter wrote, in the prison of hell, the Dr. abode of lost souls.* "In confirmation of this view," says Scott,* (1) Noah is expressly called, in Scripture, a preacher of righteousness. (2) The apostle tells us, elsewhere, that the spirit that was in the patriarchs and prophets, was the Spirit of Christ. (3) The inhabitants of the old world were disobedient, as here described, and were cut off for their sins. They were warned and called to repentance. And (4) For this very purpose, the apostle makes emphatic the preaching of Christ by Noah, to prove that they were without excuse." This passage, thus interpreted, gives no countenance to the doctrine of Christ's descent to hell. Like those before examined, it furnishes no proof in favor of the doctrine. Hence we are driven to the conclusion; that *this Article, as found in the Creeds of Christendom, has no scriptural basis: that there is no passage in all the Bible that teaches it.*

Christ's descent to *Hades* has been the great argument to prove an intermediate place, that was neither heaven nor hell. The passages, to which we have referred, have been the principal ones to prove a common receptacle of the spirits of all the departed. If Christ did not go to *Hades* after his burial, then it cannot be shown that any one of the righteous dead went thither. A careful examination of the other passages of the New Testament, in which the word *Hades* is found in the original, will confirm what we have already written. It will appear that the term sometimes signifies the grave, but that when it refers to a place beyond the grave, it is used in a bad sense, and is equivalent to *Gehenna*, the abode of the lost. Prof. Parsons,† speaking on this subject, says: "We do not find,

* In the Christ of the Apostles' Creed.

† Bib. Sacra. Vol. 13 : 160.

in the Scriptures, a passage which requires the term *Hades* to be referred to any indiscriminate abode of the dead, other than the grave: there is not a passage which speaks of a righteous man as going to it, or being connected with it. It always involves the idea of something dark and dreadful. The wicked are often said to enter it; it is, many times, positively represented as a place of punishment." We may add, surely a place that is represented as "a prison," (1 Pet. 3 : 19); with *gates* and *bars*, (Matt. 16 : 18); and *locks* (Rev. 1 : 18); whose situation is *downwards* (Matt. 11 : 23, and Luke 10 : 15); is not a fitting abode for the sainted dead. It cannot be the home, even for a season, of those who die in the Lord. The doctrine of *Hades*, the doctrine of an intermediate place, which is neither heaven nor hell, and the doctrine of Christ's descent to *Hades*, we regard as originating in mischievous errors. Very early in the history of the Christian Church, the idea arose, that, because of some imperfection still clinging to the Christian at his death, he was unfit, at once, to appear in the paradise of God; and hence an inferior paradise was created, where he must sojourn during the Intermediate State, and acquire a meetness for the supernal paradise. The purgatory of the Romanist, his *Limbum Patrum*, and his *Limbum Infantum*, are but variations of this idea. Nearly allied to this, though applying to directly opposite characters, arose the idea, that many who died impenitent and especially those who were without a revelation, were too good to be consigned immediately to *Gehenna*, the hell of the lost; and hence they originated an intermediate place for them, where it was hoped that some remedial influence might be brought to bear upon them and effect their deliverance. To give efficacy to these views and furnish some ground of expectation, that in this intermediate place (*Hades*), the righteous and the wicked would be benefited, it was deemed necessary that Christ should descend to that intermediate place and preach to its imprisoned spirits. Hence we have interpretations of Scripture to suit these views. It is scarcely necessary to add that these views are based on error, and are entirely unscriptural. The Scriptures invariably teach, that Christ is the Christian's *perfect* righteousness, that his blood cleanses from all sin, that by its sprinkling the soul is fitted to enter into the holy place. It is, therefore, a reflection upon the work of Christ, to suppose that some

other agency is necessary to fit him for heaven. It is also a reflection upon the Holy Spirit. It is his office to sanctify, to fit the soul for glory. He perfects the souls of believers in holiness, and not the shadowy regions of *Hades*. Equally unscriptural is the idea of another day of grace, another offer of mercy, to those who die out of Christ. The Bible reveals but two classes, two ways, two destinies. This life is ever represented as the season of grace. To suppose that there is another, in the future life, is in conflict with the whole tenor and spirit of the Scriptures. *Now, To-day*, is the language of inspiration. He that *liveth* and believeth, shall never die. No work in the grave.

Heaven or Hell, the immediate Portion of Departed Spirits.

We have already stated in this discussion, that there were two places in the future world, and only two; to one or the other of which, departed souls wing their way immediately, upon laying aside their earthly tabernacles. These are heaven and hell; the former, the home of the sainted dead; the latter, the abode of the impenitent dead. In the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, we have evidence of the truths here stated. Lazarus died, and was immediately carried into Abraham's bosom. This, of course, means that he was with Abraham. Where was Abraham? Certainly not in *Hades*. He was *in the kingdom of heaven*, (Matt. 8 : 11): "For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11 : 10). He was one of those, who desired a better country, that is, a heavenly; for whom God had prepared a city (Heb. 11 : 16). The rich man also died, and immediately in hell (*Hades*) he suffers the torments of the unquenchable flame. This *Hades* has all the characteristics of the *Gehenna* of fire, and is, no doubt, the same. The words of our Lord to the dying malefactor upon the cross, teach death and immediate glory, as the portion of penitent believers. "To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise," (Luke 23 : 43). The word paradise occurs three times in the New Testament. Paul speaks (2 Cor. 12 : 4) of being caught up to the third heaven, into paradise, where he heard unspeakable words; and Jesus says (Rev. 2 : 17), "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God." In both these instances, it is admitted, as referring to heaven, the eternal home of the blessed. Why should we

give it a different meaning in the only other instance in which it occurs? There is no reason, except that of supporting a doctrine, which we have shown is not found in the Bible. That paradise, in the passage above quoted, is the same as heaven, is evident, from the fact that Christ is represented as going to heaven at his death. His dying prayer was: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

It is universally admitted, that Christ, after sojourning forty days upon earth, ascended to heaven, God's dwelling place. This is distinctly stated (Acts 1 : 11). Hence, to be with Christ, is to be in heaven. This was Paul's expectation. Absent from the body, was to be present with the Lord. "We *know* that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5 : 1). The whole Bible is in harmony with these passages. Enoch, we are told, was not found, for God took him. Whither, if not to heaven? Elijah, it is expressly said, was taken up into heaven (2 Kings 2 : 11). Stephen, when dying, saw the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God. He prayed: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." His prayer was, no doubt, offered up, in the full expectation of at once entering the heavenly paradise, and enjoying communion and fellowship with his blessed Lord. The spirits of the just men made perfect, are spoken of as being in the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, along with an innumerable company of angels, and Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant. Hence, we conclude, the pious dead are not in a state or place of transition; not in *Hades*; not in a lower paradise, but in heaven, with Christ, who is at the right hand of God.

That the wicked, also, at once enter upon their eternal state, and take up their abode in hell, immediately after death, is shown, not only in the narrative already referred to, but also in what is said of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, by Jude (v. 7). These "are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." The same truth is clearly intimated by Peter (1 Epist. 3 : 19), who speaks of the wicked Antediluvians as the "spirits in prison," and this prison, we have already shown, was the prison of hell. Death and immediate entrance into heaven or hell, is the doctrine of the poets, and

the sentiment of those sacred songs, that relate to man's future state, which have been sung in every age of the Church. This doctrine is the heartfelt conviction of earnest piety, at all times, and in all lands. It has cheered the martyr amid the flames, and sustained and comforted the dying Christian, languishing into life, upon his couch. It is this sentiment that robs death of much of its sting, and the grave of much of its terror.

It does not follow, from the fact that there are but two places of abode in the future world, that there are not degrees of bliss in heaven, or of punishment in hell. We believe, that the mansions of our heavenly home are suited to the moral condition of each one; that each one will be assigned to that apartment in his Father's house, which will be suited to his capacity, whether in an embodied, or disembodied, state. So, too, there are, no doubt, compartments in hell, where each one will suffer eternally, according to the degree of his guilt. Nor are we to suppose, that, because the dead have entered upon their final and eternal state, that, therefore, no resurrection of the body will take place. This is clearly revealed, and is necessary; necessary, in order to the full redemption of man; necessary, to show the complete triumphs of the gospel over the ruins of the fall. Besides, it is proper, that the body, which, during the probationary state, should share its eternal state, whether it be one of happiness or woe. Nor are we to conclude, that this re-union of soul and body may not result in greatly increased happiness to the righteous, and greatly increased suffering to the impenitent. It will, no doubt, add to the joys of the one, and the sorrows of the other. It is, no doubt, true, that, whilst the Intermediate State will be one of great *blessedness and glory* to the righteous *in heaven*, and one of *fearful suffering and woe* to the wicked, *in hell*; the happiness of the former, and the misery of the latter, will receive their consummation only on the great day of the world's convocation, when the Judge of all the earth shall publicly announce the issues of man's probation, and invite his now embodied saints to the joys of his heavenly kingdom, and send away the impenitent to the realms of darkness, to endure everlasting punishment.

ARTICLE II.

TRUE FAITH: ITS NATURE AND EFFICACY.

By REV. N. VAN ALSTINE, Minden, N. Y.

The doctrine of true faith occupies a prominent position in the system of religious truths. It is vital to the life of Christianity. It is essential to the full development and permanence of the Christian Church. It is equally important to the justification, salvation and spiritual life of the individual Christian. Repudiate this doctrine, tear it out of the creed of the Church, and we eclipse our hope of eternal happiness, and undermine the living fabric of the Church. True, it is not the only doctrine that is fundamental in the gospel of Christ, in relation to the work and progress of justifying grace, and the completion of the full development of religion, in time and in eternity; but it holds as near a relation to Christ, the great unoriginated life of Christianity, as any other doctrine possibly can sustain. Without it we can have no true gospel, no justified and saved professors of Christ, and no living, prosperous Church, embodying the essential elements, and practically exemplifying the pure principles, of the kingdom of God. We may have those who are baptized with the name of Christians, and the organized body, called the Church, conforming to all the rules of religious and sacramental worship; but these, without evangelical faith, are false to the name, and to God, and the other is a sham of the holy mystical body of Christ.

Christ is the Rock, the firm and permanent foundation of the Church, which, when truly organized and sanctified, constitutes "the pillar and ground of the truth." When she infolds in her life, and in all her parts, the essential doctrines of the Bible, being invigorated and developed by their native forces, and presenting the full proportions of the body of Christ, strongly unfolded, she will bid defiance to the foul assaults of infidelity, and the fierce storms of the corruptions of earth. She will prove by her doctrine, worship, spiritual life and vigorous operations in Christ's great missionary and legitimate work, that she is not a

misnomer and a caricature of her true character and professed loyalty. She will show, that God intended that she should embrace a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a household of faith, constantly encircling his altar of worship, to diffuse truth, knowledge and purity, and spread his kingdom over the whole earth. To do this, there is need of true faith; but this faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. What is this faith? What does it effect? To answer these questions, and to unfold and apply the great principle of *justifying and saving faith*, is the chief object of this discussion.

The Nature of True Faith.

Every truth is confronted by falsehood, and every Christian virtue by its counterfeit; hence there is need of enlightened reason and moral sense, to discriminate, to accept and reject. If there is a true and a false faith, the one leading to spiritual life and glory, and the other to deception, death, and final misery, then it is necessary to understand the subject, and be governed by the truth, as taught by Christ. Faith is a result, an effect, of some legitimate cause, though it also is a secondary cause to a legitimate effect, whether it be hope, or fear, or salvation, depending on the character of the faith exercised, and its objects. When the mind is brought under the influence of truth, convinced and governed by it, then we see the psychological process of the product of faith. Without conviction, there can be no faith, for the mind must possess light and, at least, apprehend the object, either by personal knowledge, or by sufficient testimony. Therefore the Romish Church proclaims the doctrine of faith erroneously, when she teaches that man does not need to apprehend every truth on which to exercise faith, only explicit faith on the Church, and *implicit* faith on all the Church contains; that the right of private judgment is heretical; that the prerogative of interpretation and judgment, is lodged only in the Church; and that her uttered dogmas, are all-authoritative, and the full limitation as to the objects of faith. Equally false is it to teach, that a mere intellectual conviction, and an historical belief, constitute justifying and saving faith. Faith, as a mere mental process, is one thing, but *saving faith* is something more, higher and holier.

1. The faith that *justifies* and *saves* the soul from sin,

must have the knowledge of those truths in living connection with Christ. Not the mere abstract truths of God, but those especially, which have been baptized in the fountain of Christ's wisdom and purity and blood. These we must feel and realize, for when the soul exercises this faith, it is necessary to have a concurrence of the understanding and will, to *know* the truth and *assent* to it. A faith that does not apprehend the doctrines of Christ, and choose to be controlled by him, can never translate us into the realm of spiritual light and life. The Christian does not live and ripen for heaven by any virtue, found inherent in ceremonial worship, nor by any native goodness in himself, for to these he is dead as sources of righteousness, slain by the moral law and his sins, therefore he is constrained and governed by the doctrine of faith on the Son of God. Shut up the soul in darkness and ignorance, close up every avenue of the light and glory of truth to the understanding and will, with the affections and desires, and you render the exercise of intelligent and saving faith impossible. For how shall we believe in that, of which we have never heard, of which we have no clear and definite conception? True, we may not fully comprehend every doctrine of the divine plan of redemption, of the nature and character of God and the Messiah, for our faith has more to do with *fact* and *testimony*, than with the philosophical analysis of truth and the Godhead, or even the mysteries of the gospel. We must, at least, clearly apprehend (if not fully comprehend) the real existence of Christ, his offices as teacher, sacrificer and lord, and the momentous object of his mission, his adequate qualifications and sufficiency, to save all who come to him by faith. Without this knowledge and assurance of faith, what motive can we have to seek, ask and make the effort to secure salvation? None at all, but utter darkness will brood over the soul in dismal and hopeless despondency.

If knowledge must precede and accompany justifying faith, the light of truth and the Holy Spirit, is equally necessary, to manifest our sins, pollution and great danger; to reveal the necessity, suitableness and sufficiency of the blood of Christ, as a remedy. Not to know, feel and realize these cardinal truths of the gospel, would utterly exclude the possibility and suitable anxiety, to come to Christ under the promptings of saving faith. As it is the unequivocal testimony of God, that, without faith, it is im-

possible to be saved, therefore the real necessity, that the light of truth and knowledge, should be imparted so fully to the soul, as to afford a clear consciousness of our sinful and ruined condition, our utter unfitness for heaven and companionship of the good and holy, and that, nowhere else than in Christ, can salvation be found. So soon as we are fully enlightened, to know and feel assured that Christ is an all-sufficient Saviour, that his blood will cleanse from every stain and guilt of sin, when applied, we feel encouraged to come, with undoubting faith and a loving heart. Then it may be said, blessed is he, who has the requisite knowledge and the genuine faith, and participates gloriously in Christ's free and full salvation.

2. The saving faith of Christ requires the *cordial assent of the will*, as well as the understanding. It is, doubtless, true, that many know the truth, and their sinful state, and never come to Christ for salvation. The obvious, and only reason, is, they rebel against their conviction. Knowledge and conviction do not necessitate submission to the will of God and plan of redemption, the proximate step to faith and salvation. Herein we behold the pertinence of the *assent of the will*, after receiving the illumination of the truth and the Spirit, to the *exercise* of true faith in Christ. Faith that is true, energetic and controlling, will induce legitimate action and corresponding fruit, otherwise it is dead and fruitless. As the will is the governing power of the soul, it must *assent to*, and acquiesce in, the motives of the gospel and salvation and be controlled, and hence direct all the mental and moral faculties of the mind in faith and consecration to God. Mere assent, is not faith, but it is an essential element and link in the chain to draw the soul to Christ. He that *cometh* to Christ, must believe that he is, and the rewarder of those who diligently seek him.

The understanding, under the influence of light and truth, assents to the doctrines of God, and the credibility of the Bible, all the reasons and arguments adduced are sufficiently cogent, conclusive and convincing to support our belief; then to make them effective and practical, we need the *assent of the will*, to choose God for our portion and object of worship, and the Bible as our code of law to regulate our life and give growth to a holy character. Intoxicate and govern the affections, feelings and desires of the heart, and restrain the assent of both the understand-

ing and will, by atheistical thoughts and incredulity, and you positively and effectually preclude all possible acts of true faith in God or the Bible, and rear up an unsurpassible barrier to become savingly interested in the Divine Saviour. True faith, therefore, governs the will, determines the choice of right objects, by the concurrent assent and dictate of the understanding, in harmony with all the moral feelings, emotions and affections of the heart; for as soon as a conquest of the will is obtained, all the other rebellious powers submit to the government of grace and of Christ. Then we discover another development of the harmonious and beautiful system of the saving religion of the gospel.

3. True faith manifests entire *approbation* of Christ as our Saviour. Approbation expresses the state or disposition of mind, in which we see the fitness of certain things and their arrangement to work out a desirable end, therefore the view creates a feeling of gratification and happiness. We approve of the means, and are pleasantly excited in contemplating the object. It is certain that justifying faith exhibits our approval of Christ as a suitable and sufficient Saviour. But in order to approve of Christ, we need the illumination of the Spirit, to enable us to see our ruined moral condition, as sinners before God; to feel that our destruction is imminent, and the great necessity of speedy help from some external source. We are dead in sin, shut up in a horrible pit of sinking mire and unable to deliver and save ourselves. We must inevitably perish, without the helping hand of Christ.

If the light of God should shine only into our dismal dungeon of sin, we should be overwhelmed by billows of despair and be constrained to cry out in agony, there is no deliverance from the wretchedness of a horrid death; but the sunlight of heaven is spread over the whole area of the gospel, and there we behold suitable means devised, and the influences of love and mercy in full play to effect our salvation. Convinced that the whole arrangement of the gospel is wisely adapted and possessed of abundant virtue and effectiveness to work out a complete salvation, therefore by faith we look and trust on the Son of God. As in it we see the wisdom of God revealed from heaven, we are pleased and approve; we embrace and are blessed.

Now, approbation of Christ is not *impractical*, for there is nothing *repulsive* in him. The sinner who is deeply

conscious of sin, and in the agony of his feeling, should look to Christ for help, and discover such signs of weakness in him, as might render him inadequate to the work of redemption, or such symptoms of pride as might bring upon himself a supercilious treatment in his profound humiliation for his sins and folly, or such super-abundance of passion as might control his judgment and direct his dealings by fluctuating or cruel caprice, he might be repelled in his feelings and approach to Christ, as the mighty and willing Saviour. But there is nothing repulsive in the character of Christ, in his doctrine, in his moral perfections and his remedial work, to all who are divinely illuminated, deeply conscious of sin and of their need of help. To such, Christ is the chief among ten thousand, the fulness of all that is lovely, and none so much desired and longed for as he. The Father could look through the eye of holiness, at his baptism in Jordan, and behold in him the paragon of perfection and moral worth, and utter in an audible voice, his sense of approbation: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." So lovely was he, while coronated in his uncreated glory, or heartily and obediently engaged to give a practical solution to the stupendous work of human redemption, that it was divinely said: "Let all the angels worship him." Even on the ignominious cross, there issued forth such light, truth, purity, moral worth, such fulness of redemptive mercy and grace, that the eyes of all should be attracted and gaze with wonder and delight on his suffering, majesty and glory. Oh, how lovely and beloved is our anointed Saviour and Advocate in earth and in heaven! Honored and approved by the glorious host and glorified ones on high! Should not, therefore, all sinful beings approve and claim him as their Saviour, and crown him Lord of all?

4. True faith is always characterized with the *choice and obedience of the will*. Speculation and critically learned disquisitions have passed and repassed, in stern conflict, the metaphysical arena of the will. All this studied and intense discussion, doubtless, possesses importance and utility in the investigation of truth; but it lies outside of the design of this essay. It is enough for us to know and recognize, that the soul is a pure spirituality, indivisible and indestructible, possessing the function of will, the power that determines action and makes choice. The will is free,

possessing in itself the spring of action, and not dependent, as matter, for action, as acted upon. This freedom is inborn, therefore the soul is responsible to God for the exercise and character of its choice. To attach responsibility to the mind for the choice of the will, it is necessary for reason to be unobstructed and able to distinguish between truth and falsehood; the moral sense to discriminate between right and wrong; the volitions of the will to be self-decided, or the mind to determine its own action and choice. Man, thus constituted, becomes the subject of moral government, held under law to God, and responsible for the formation of a correct moral character; for this reason God enforces his authority by commands, promises and impassioned entreaties, to induce a course of life in vital connection with a blissful immortality. In the light of the character of God, his supreme and universal government, and his relation to all his creatures; and man's intellectual and moral constitution, his relations and responsibilities to God, and his great and final destiny, we may understand the absolute necessity, that our will should assent, choose and submit, to the will of God, in the exercise of saving faith and the attainment of a Christian heart. When Christ becomes the ruling power of the soul, all else must bow in subjection, for he is Lord of all. In true and saving faith, we *obey* God and *choose* the right.

5. True faith receives Christ as he is *offered in the gospel*. The emphatic and pertinent declaration of the apostle is: "So we preach and so ye believe." The doctrines and proposals of the gospel, clearly and faithfully made known, are to be accepted with honest hearts—received and practiced as offered by the accredited ministry of the Master. So Noah conformed to the will of God, when warned and instructed to prepare an Ark for the safety of himself and family from the fearful catastrophe of the Deluge, and land every living creature beyond the flood to replenish the earth. So Abraham received the message of God, and carried its instructions in his daily life, by faith and obedience. And so true faith always receives the offers of the gospel, and practices the precepts of Christ in their spirit and obvious intention, with cordiality and reverential fear. It certainly is not allowable in the economy of the gospel and of salvation, with the established *mode* and *means* of attaining grace and eternal life, to substitute an-

other *method*, diverse and conflicting, to secure the same object. Since God has set up his covenant of mercy and life, ordered and secure in all its arrangements, it is absolutely necessary to conform to its requirements and provisions, to avail ourselves of its benefits. We must dissent from none, but comply cheerfully with all. The feeling to except, has the ingredient of unbelief.

Christ is offered in the gospel *sincerely*, and as a real Saviour. As he is offered to a penitent race, so he should be received. If God is honest and sincere, means what he says, and will make good his proposal, and will not tantalize our feeling and disappoint our expectations, then we should be honest and sincere in every feeling of the heart and purpose of the soul, when we accept Christ, as our Saviour and Master. Hypocrisy, in all its convolutions, hidings and false pretences, is naked and open to the eye of God, and is always, and everywhere, an abomination in the presence of holiness and heaven. If any class of sinners were scathed by the hot denunciations of Christ, while on earth, they were the hypocrites among the Jews, who drew nigh to him and honored him with their lips, while their hearts were far away, full of thoughts and plans to injure and destroy him. Instead of faith, they were full of unbelief; their condition increasing in desperation, and their feet already pressing on the crumbling margin of their fearful destiny, laved by the fiery billows of damnation. Hence the honest, loving and holy Saviour, whose lips were used to utter words of kindness and meekness, but whose heart could cherish no fellowship with hypocrisy and the unfruitful works of darkness, was constrained to utter this withering interrogation: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

Every sinner with a penitent heart and true faith, will come to Christ with *honest* and *sincere* intention, yielding obedience to the word of life, and make a full and perpetual consecration of himself to his service and glory. If ever honest and sincere, it will be, when true faith does up the work of spiritual life and hope in his soul. Then deceit and double-dealing will find no shelter in his bosom, for his heart is actuated by motives as clear as sun-light and as pure as the drifting snow. The eye of the Saviour resting on the penitent, while approaching him with such sincerity of feeling and purpose, he will be prompted to

say, "An Israelite, indeed, in whom there is no guile." When the gospel is received sincerely and reverently, then the abundant and enriching blessings of grace are secured, and man goes forth on his pilgrimage justified and in peace.

In all the multiplicity of doctrines and precepts contained in the gospel; there is *unity* of truth, spirit and purpose. The gospel contains no absurdities and contradictions to neutralize its teaching and undermine its object. Therefore in the offering of Christ to our race, he must be sought after and accepted as a whole, and not as a divided Saviour; though manifold in his relations and offices, yet there is a unity of design. He did not assume, nor holds, a single relation or office, that can be dispensed with as useless and non-essential to constitute him the Great High Priest, the mighty Saviour and Bishop of souls. He is perfect God, perfect Man and perfect Messiah. In him there is no super-abundance of endowments, nor essential defectiveness; as he is, he is offered, in the gospel, to the reason, moral feelings and affections of men, and, as such, he must be accepted in entirety by unequivocating faith. If he presents himself to the world as a teacher, it presupposes the fact of gross ignorance and the necessity that the resulting darkness should be dissipated by the light of truth; therefore, we should receive him as the Great Prophet, hear and obey his voice. God raised him up as the Great Teacher, in some respects, like Moses, with superior endowments, and as the depository of infinite wisdom and knowledge; hence we should listen "to his gracious words," and be made wise unto salvation. He came also as the Great High Priest, to offer up the one all-atoning sacrifice, to cleanse from sin and sanctify all who come unto God by him; and also to stand before the mercy-seat as their Intercessor, and to lead them into the Holiest, by the merit of his own precious blood. So necessary is it that mankind should receive him as their Priest, and so essential to their purification and future well-being, that a rejection of him will sweep away every refuge of safety and shut up the world in darkness, without a single glimmering ray of hope and of heaven. There will remain no other sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for vengeance and fiery indignation, which shall overwhelm the enemies of God.

When men are taught and saved from sin, they need

rules and directions, to guide them and train them in the Christian life. The life of God in the soul, needs vigorous growth, blossoming and fruitfulness in a righteous character. In order to govern and help them up to perfection, Christ becomes their Lord. "He is Lord of all." As a king governs and protects the nation, suppresses vice and wards off ruinous calamities, encourages patriotism, loyalty and material prosperity; so Christ, as Lord in the kingdom of heaven, holds the sceptre of authority, gives laws, weeds out lust and corruption, until his people become a peculiar people, zealous of good works. As King, he rules the heart, the affections, desires and purposes, and will carry forward the noble conquest of the world, till nations bow before his throne and acknowledge his sceptre. The Psalmist felt the willing obedience predominant in the hearts of all saints, when he said: "Do with me as seemeth good in thy sight." Christ will have no traitors, no rivals, for he alone has the right to reign.

Christ is offered as the *only* Saviour. Besides him there is none other. Take him and live; reject him, and die. Many, however, do reject him; they even abhor him as the contemptible Nazarene. Any other Saviour, any other Way to heaven than by him, any other man than Christ, even Barabbas, is more highly esteemed and preferred. This same feeling of bitterness and persecution was prevalent in the days of the prophets, when the people hewed out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that could hold no water. Neither could they see any comeliness in Christ, for which he was desirable, therefore they turned a deaf ear to the voice of his teaching, and a hard, rebellious heart against his proposals of mercy. Heaven and eternal life they, doubtless, desired; but they chose to climb up some other way, than to enter through Christ as the door. The people, at the present time, have many teachers and ways, which they prefer to Christ, who tenderly cares for their great interests, and the highway of holiness cast up for the ransomed of the Lord to tread. Some seek for salvation by the deeds of the law, by legal, rigorous and self-effected works, by morality and consistent living, by ritual performances and punctilious attentions to the externals of religious worship; others seek the same object by a sort of religious outgrowth, evoked from the soil of the natural heart by careful educational training. They highly approve of the axiom, that man is naturally a re-

ligious being, and then hastily seize upon the presumption, as though correlative, that, all that is necessary to fully prepare for companionship with God and angels, is the education of that religious nature, expanded and matured, and all is inevitably right. This system, therefore, does not need a redemptive plan, wrought out by the obedience, suffering and death of Christ, for this implies the doctrine of fallen humanity, the utter destitution of innate virtuous goodness and holiness, the need of the Holy Spirit for illumination, repentance, faith, the radical renovation of the heart, and that salvation is derived from God and not the product of mental development. Hence we sometimes read such unchristian aphorisms, "It is absurd to suppose, that God can forgive sin *only* in pursuance of the sufferings of Christ." Again, "So far as entrance into heaven is concerned, the saint and sinner stand on a level." Not so the teachings of Christ's gospel, for he offers himself as the only Saviour. He has uttered the voice, that is now pealing through the world: "I am the way, the truth, the life; no man cometh to the Father except by me;" and Paul re-echoes the emphatic voice, when he says: "There is no other name given under heaven among men, whereby we can be saved." After thorough study and long experience, Paul gives vent to his feeling and deep anxiety: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ," Phil. 3 : 9. Not only was Christ his *only* Saviour; but also the *only* source and vigor of his religious life. What else does he express when he says? "For I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I might live unto God, I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. 2 : 19—21.

Christ is offered *freely*, the merciful gift of God, and as such he must be accepted. He, who hath redeemed us with his own precious blood, and not with gold and silver; who loved us and gave himself for us as a sin-offering, that we might be clothed with the righteousness of God, be cleansed from all iniquity and have everlasting life; he certainly will not permit us, "wretched sinners," to add

anything to the merit and share in the glory of our redemption. We are poor, and have nothing; blind, and need eye-salve; naked, and must receive, from some source, the garment of praise; sick and in prison, and need kind ministrations and curative applications; shall self-deception, indifference, pride or a disdainful spirit, influence us to turn away from the great Benefactor, and the *only* Physician who can do helpless sinners good? And then, too, when he offers his services *freely*, and will enrich us for time and eternity with inexhaustible goodness and glory as the *gift* of God. Marvelous kindness, incomprehensible love and infinite bowels of compassion are revealed in the atonement, in the proposals and applications of the gospel to a sinful world! Oh, let us accept the gift as offered, meekly, readily and heartily, and be saved! True faith will receive it without misgiving or prevarication.

The Efficacy of True Faith.

The object of the gospel is to instruct, to convince and persuade, to pardon and purify, to make us the heirs and children of God; divine truth is the appointed instrumentality, accompanied by the Holy Spirit; and true faith is the receptive soil of the heart, mellow, fertile and yielding abundantly the fruit of righteousness. With true faith in Christ, we are complaisant before the eye of God, therefore blessed and happy.

1. True faith receives Christ; unbelief rejects him. These are opposite exercises and states of the mind; antagonisms in composition, in qualities and results. Faith receives Christ, and in him opens the foundation of spiritual life, deriving refreshment, fruitfulness and buoyant hope; unbelief spurns him and turns away from every avenue of mercy, of life and holy joy. True faith is gracious, commendable, excellent, well-pleasing to God; while unbelief is more prolific, destructive and abominable than any other sin; it is a parent of sin, and the most damning. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth not, shall be damned,*" Mark 16: 16. Faith in a crucified Christ will save, and become the life of the soul; while unbelief nourishes sin and brings moral death and fights against God; for unbelief dishonors God, slights Christ and esteems his atoning blood an unworthy thing, burlesques the wisdom of God in the atonement and

counts it foolishness, frustrates the design of the gospel, and destroys the Fatherhood of God, reducing our race to a state of orphanage. Where is there another sin so void of every virtuous element and such a decoction of blackness, baseness and maliciousness as the sin of unbelief? It wars on earth and on heaven and is determined on a universal wreck. But true faith reaches forth its hand for the gift of God with meekness and grateful feeling, obedient to the divine word, dependent for support on the strength of Christ, separate from wilful sin, hopeful in the spiritual conflicts with lust, principalities and powers, cheerful in duties and toil, ecstatic in its songs of praise to Him who is the Author of eternal redemption. Faith receives, and whoever accepts Christ shall in no wise become an outcast.

2. True faith *justifies* and *purifies* the heart. To justify is to absolve from guilt, to remove crime and substitute innocence, for when God justifies, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" To wash the hands in innocence and encompass the divine altar with bold and confident hearts, are the inestimable privileges of the sons of God, secured by faith in Christ. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God." "The just shall live by faith." True faith does not justify and purify the sinner by any intrinsic virtue, or meritorious exercise, but by waiting on Christ, properly receiving the gift of grace and righteousness and making the appropriation to the destitute soul. Therefore the sinner is saved by Christ, through faith as the unmerited gift of God. As a man without the hand, cannot do the work appropriate to that member; so the condemned sinner can not come to Christ and be saved, without the medium of faith, "for he that cometh to God *must believe*."

The work of *pardon* and justification of those covered with the sin and guilt of rebellion, in view of all the surroundings in God, his government and the constitution of things, is one of the most difficult and marvelous acts of the Infinite God. We know the very thing has been and is being done; the undoubted fact lies out clear as sunlight to the keen eye of faith. Neither angel nor saint can question the reality. But before the problem was demonstrated, astonishment rested on the thoughts of angelic minds and played on their glancing eye. Darius, the king of the East, studied the problem with distressing

anxiety and biased mind, until the going down of the sun; but he found no solution, no possible expediency, to save Daniel from the lions' den and maintain his law and defend his throne. He only found the penalty was inevitable and must be executed. To pardon the culprit is, doubtless, one of the most perplexing acts the Executives of civil government are required to perform. The sanctity, force and authority of law must be upheld, crime must be detested, discouraged and not lose its warning voice in the ear of the public, the guilty must be punished and obedient, patriotic citizens be protected, how then shall the honest executive pardon criminals and conserve the general good? God has demonstrated the problem in the atonement wrought out by Christ, through toil, suffering and the cross. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," Rom. 3 : 21—26. Not only was the believing Jew justified and sanctified by faith in Christ, but the same virtue and saving influence was felt in the souls of Gentiles, for "God put no difference between them purifying their hearts by faith." While this faith is found effective and saving in all hearts open to its reception and improvement, none can be saved, where true faith is a stranger.

3. True faith secures *spiritual adoption* and a *bond of union* with Christ. The relation of sonship is not natural and underived, for the human race are aliens from God, in their moral condition they are "dead in trespasses and sins;" "they are the children of wrath," always actuated by the "spirit of disobedience," fulfilling the lust of the flesh. In order to become the sons of God, they need the remission of sin, and deliverance from the penalty of the law, the renovation of their moral nature and restoration to the image of God, to the rights and relations which accrue to believers in the covenant of Grace. Paul says:

"Ye are all the sons of God by faith." "If sons, then heirs, joint-heirs with Christ." Being adopted into the spiritual household of faith and family of God, we are entitled to all the immunities and rights of children. We are no longer the sons of a legal and ceremonial dispensation, but heirs according to promise; no longer treated as strangers and aliens, but fellow-citizens of a heavenly kingdom, sustaining the new relation of children, and enjoying facilities for instruction and development of the filial feelings of the heart and a congenial character in our new home. It may now be said, in the language of the apostle John: "Beloved, now are ye the sons of God;" partakers of the divine nature, bearing the image of Christ, the peculiar objects of his care and love, favored with his indwelling Spirit, to mould the soul for heaven, free from sin, guilt and the fear of death, inspired with holy boldness and unwavering confidence, and possessed with certain hope of the inheritance of the riches of our Father's home in glory. How great was the love to take us from our wretched condition, to remove our filthy and ragged garment and put on the best robe; to spread an abundant table in this wilderness, to satisfy the hungry, and to register our names among the generations of the righteous. This is not all of the rich blessing of true faith in Christ. We are not only made the children of God and heirs of imperishable riches; but there is formed also a strong and vital union between saints and their Saviour. As there is a union between the vine and its branches, so there is between Christ and believers. They are engrafted in Christ, and as the branch drinks in the nourishment of the vine, so, through faith, Christ imparts his own spiritual life and grace to the children of God. Hence they grow, bud, blossom and bear fruit. Seeing that all true believers are bound together by a strong family tie, and more strongly united to Christ, and through the Saviour to God, we may feel the force of the emotion and burning truth, struggling for utterance from the lips of Paul, when he says: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is

the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with the fulness of God," Eph. 3: 14—19.

4. *True faith is the root of growth in grace, and the spring of peace and joy.* This supposes that we possess saving grace, and are blessed of God. This cannot be otherwise, for we have arrived at our heavenly Father's house in our spiritual pilgrimage. The character and heart are radically changed, our associations and relations are all new, emptied of all vanity and self-righteousness, once ignorant of God's righteousness we toiled to work out one for ourselves, but now we live in Christ, by faith and love, and strive to abound yet more and more in goodness and the fulness of Christ. The command is, "to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth." It was true in the Reformation, it was both the fountain of light and consolation to Luther, and the support of his courage and hope, that, "the just shall live by faith." Faith in this revealed truth swept away from the area of the Reformation the egregious falsehood, that justification might be found in rites and ceremonies, in genuflexions and penance. It brought back to the Church a living Christ, to be loved and worshiped, and repudiated dead relics and religious mummary. Indeed, the tree of Christianity started with fresh life in its roots; the swelling bud, the unfolding leaf and bloom, only anticipated the ripe fruit of pardon, peace and joy. "The just shall live by faith" was the resurrection power given to a dead Church, gave bones and flesh, nerved every muscle for the herculean task to diffuse life and holiness through the world.

This doctrine of evangelical faith, is the root of spiritual life in every Christian heart; as it grows, enlarges in capacity and effectiveness, it affords a larger measure of life and nourishment to the trunk and branches of personal piety. The child of God is growing in grace, in moral goodness and usefulness, for he "adds to his faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ,"

2 Peter 1 : 5—8. These things I do, says the great apostle of the Gentiles: "I forget the things that are behind and reach forth unto those things which are before; I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Certainly, if faith is nourishment to the incipient root of true piety in the heart, it is needful to its growth and maturity; and religion will be vigorous and effective in proportion to the energetic nature and operation of faith. Without faith we can not please God, neither begin to live, nor grow in godliness and holiness. As the soul is void of grace without faith, so the Church is dead in its absence.

Faith is the spring of peace and joy. Not that a personal faith in itself communicates uninterrupted peace and cloudless joy, for it is only the channel from Christ, the fountain to the heart. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom we also have access by faith into this grace, wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Peter lifts up his voice in sweet concert with Paul in utterance of this blessed truth. "Yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Not only have we the New Testament Scriptures teaching the sublime doctrine of spiritual growth and joy in personal piety; but the same truths come welling up in unison from the very altar of God in the old dispensation. Says the Psalmist: "I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living." "He brought me up also out of the horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings. And he hath put a new song into my mouth, even praise unto my God." The prophet says: "The ransomed of the Lord shall return to come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their head: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Peace in believing, will afford great peace in dying, and then an inheritance incorruptible and a crown that shall never fade, reserved in heaven for all who love the final appearing of Jesus Christ.

5. True faith affords and confirms *full assurance* of an interest in Christ. *Assurance* implies an enlightened understanding and full confidence; the ground of full persuasion and utmost certainty, excluding all doubt. As

Paul asserts in reference to Christ the appointed Judge of the world: "Whereof he hath given *assurance* to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." In religious assurance there is, therefore, firmness of mind and certain knowledge of the interest we cherish in Christ and the expectation of a full fruition of everlasting life. The apostle exhorts: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." He adds: "And we desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end." Some, indeed, may doubt the possibility of attaining, in this life, that state of mind implied in the doctrine of the full assurance of faith, of religious experience, and of the certain hope of eternal salvation; nevertheless, we believe that it is consistent with the teachings of the Bible and the experience of Christians on the earth. The perplexities and conflicts, felt and lamented by some, doubtless good Christians, do not necessarily prove the doctrine false or impracticable, for all these difficulties may originate in a state of mind, that is not entirely free from doubts, occasioned by an imperfect or variable illumination of the Spirit. Faith may either be weak or encumbered with doubts, or alternate, at times, between both. The mental powers and moral sentiments do not work as vigorously, steadily and decisively in some persons as in others. Yet true faith cannot doubt the object, whether Christ, religion, or eternal life. In some persons there may be too much timidity, or cautiousness, for the *conscious assurance* of a real interest in saving grace, notwithstanding, whatever true faith believes must be *assuredly* believed. Who can doubt that Christ is *able* to save, and that he *will save* when we believe? The immutable promises of God lie underneath, and faith is permitted to plant itself on this immovable foundation. The essence of true faith works out the assurance that Christ is truly revealed, and that he will do as he has promised, for his power, will and veracity are poised on his word.

God also gives us the assurance of the possibility of obtaining a real interest in salvation from sin and secure an adequate fitness for heaven. If some have failed, and others doubt the attainment of reliable and satisfactory evidences of such a moral state of the heart, they do not therefore assuredly prove that God has not taught the doctrine, and that good people never have experienced it. God has certainly taught its attainability. "Ye have re-

ceived the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," Rom. 8 : 15, 16. "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure," 2 Pet. 1 : 10. "And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments," 1 Jno. 2 : 3. "*We know that we have passed from death unto life*, because we love the brethren," 1 Jno. 3 : 14. Here we have the evidence by obedience in life and character, also the evidence in the heart, by love and the witness of the Spirit, and also the earnest of our inheritance and seal of final redemption. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory," Eph. 1 : 13, 14. Precious is the sacred word by which we are thus taught, welcome is the Holy Spirit, by whom it is savingly and sanctifyingly applied, gracious and satisfactory are the responses of the moral sentiments of the mind, where the great practical work of redemption is wrought out, and where all the fruit of love, humility, meekness, hope, peace and joy hang in rich clusters on the tree of life. Who can prefer to live without this spiritual workmanship of God in the soul, by which we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus? Who will dare to die with a heart made desolate by sin and unrestored by the grace and Spirit of Christ? O sinner! the half suffocating response of your soul will roll in thunder peals over your dismal and wilful ruin, and reverberate along the walls of the "blackness of darkness forever!" In Christ is thy remedy—seize it quickly!

No question is of more importance than the following, and a definite answer is pertinent to the previous investigation. How can we determine our personal interest in Christ?

For a person to determine his position, to correctly and satisfactorily decide his relation to grace and to God, is a matter of intrinsic importance. On it his well-being in time and eternity will depend. If he be in Christ, what are the antecedents found in the preparatory work of grace? There must be a beginning and progress, as well as consummation. Certain things will characterize the preparatory work. Doubtless, the very beginning of this gra-

cious work of salvation, will be seen in *divine illumination*. Christ, who is the Light of the world, enlightens every man that cometh into the world. While he is wholly under the dominion of sin, he gropes his way in darkness, for the god of this world has blinded the mind of those who believe not. There is no moral light in him, until the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ shall shine into his heart. When thus enlightened of the Spirit, he may rest assured the work of mercy and truth has begun in his soul. The next development will be seen in *conviction of sin*. When the work of conviction was wrought in the heart of Paul, he declared it was the result of light and truth by the law, for when the commandment was brought in contact with his mind, sin appeared and his righteousness dies. Thus the *divine word* conveys the light of heaven into the soul, enlightens the understanding and awakens the moral sentiments, resulting in the conviction of sin. In the presence of this light, sin rises up from the sea of pollution and darkness, and the sinner first discovers his rebellion against God and exposure to eternal death. Conviction of sin, more or less pungent and overwhelming, is the inevitable fruit of an enlightened understanding and awakened conscience. From this result he cannot escape; he must meet it and feel it; and then he may either accept its issue and directing influence, or rebel stoutly and at great hazard, against light, truth and God. Illumination and conviction, producing their unobstructed result, will effect and manifest in the sinner's heart *self-despair*. Sins, so great and criminal in the presence of a holy God, were never before fully realized; so unworthy of mercy and so weak to work out his own deliverance from such a deplorable and ruined condition, he never really comprehended, therefore he feels himself sinking beneath the dark, dashing waves of *self-despair*; no hope, no mercy is his bitter and agonizing lamentation. This bitter cup every repenting sinner must drink to its dregs, in coming to Christ; the only difference is, that it is larger and its mixture more bitter to one person than to another. While thus overwhelmed in sorrow, agony and despondency—ready to perish—faith lifts its imploring eye to Christ, the *only* Saviour, and utters, in distressing accents, the earnest prayer for mercy: "Help! Oh help, thou Son of David!" The benignant face of Jesus is turned, and the attentive ear catches the ringing cries for mercy; and

through the tempest of passion and excitement, his voice is heard, in calm and pacifying accents, saying: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light," Matt. 11 : 28—30. This voice is cordially heeded and obeyed. The work is done. The kingdom of grace is set up in the soul, and Christ begins to reign. The abundant and joyous feeling of the heart anoints the lips with the new song, even praise unto God.

But how shall he know this work to be of God, and to be the true work of the Spirit and grace? There is error as well as truth, hypocrisy as well as reality, deception as well as honesty and sincerity, fanaticism as well as true religion. Man should know it; he may understand and discriminate, for God has given the touch-stone, the Spirit and the word will use it correctly and give reliability, and the judgment and moral feelings will witness a responsive testimony. The work has its characteristic in the heart and in the life, indicating the genuineness of renovating grace. The soul will be *serious* and *deeply in earnest*. It is no trivial affair in itself, or in its operation, and it is vital and far-reaching in its consequences. If ever the soul is in earnest, it is in passing from death into life, from sin to holiness, from Satan to God. Every instance, recorded in the Bible, discloses this fact and makes this impression. The three thousand converted on the day of Pentecost, were serious and in earnest, and were successful. The blind son of Timeus, was greatly in earnest; every encumbrance was flung aside, and every impediment was surmounted. He could only feel satisfied when he felt the healing and restoring touch of Christ, and went away seeing and rejoicing. The jailor was stirred up to the very base of his soul, entirely resolved on the object of his salvation; nothing could, seemingly, change the current of his feeling and the fixed purpose of his mind; he seized hold of Christ, by faith, and salvation came to himself and family. The promise is: "In the day that ye seek me with all your heart, I will be found of you." Instead of *pride* and *exaltation*, there will be *humility* and *self-abasement*. The penitent and sin-sick soul will see nothing for which he should be inflated with pride, rise up in self-importance and in his own esteem; but will see very much for which

he should be humbled, feel himself unworthy, and sink in self-abasement. He that humbles himself shall be exalted. And also how weary of sin does the sinner feel, and what longing anxiety for mercy and deliverance, since the conflict of the soul, between hope and fear, has been so sharp and so long. Every power of the mind is nerved to its utmost tension, entirely ready and willing to submit and be satisfied with the conquest of grace. Every chord of the soul vibrates in unison with the expression, "Not my will, but thine, O Lord, be done." Redemption is effected by the precious blood of Christ, the contract is made, signed and sealed.

What are the effects, the ripe fruit beyond the blossoms? What else but *love* to Christ, for he is now the chiefest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely? If love, then *obedience* to his commandments, for hereby the Christian proves the sincerity of his love, and by obedience to the truth, he purifies his heart unto unfeigned love of the brethren. God is holy, therefore the Christian should be holy, for without holiness no man shall see God. Since faith, love and holiness dwell in the heart, the *hope* of glory shall not be wanting, for that is the anchor of the soul on this tempestuous ocean of life, and enters into that within the veil. Here stands the Christian, the child of God and the heir of heaven. What person can suppress the desire to be one, to die the death of the righteous, and that his last end be with Christ in heaven?

Can we be such, and how obtain the boon? Persons are liable to make mistakes, more or less grievous and destructive. Some grasp for the shadow and reject the substance; others choose the *means*, instead of the end of religion, for they put their trust in sermons, in prayers, in personal reformations, in religious rites and ordinances, and that Christ is lost sight of. These, and other things, may be the means to lead them to Christ; for this purpose only they should be used and relied upon; but not employed as a substitute for Christ, and looked to as the efficacious channel of eternal life. Without Christ there can be no religion, and without faith the penitent sinner can not come to Christ, and live in sweet fellowship with him. "None but Jesus can do helpless sinners good."

Some embrace religion as an experiment, a mere matter of expediency, and seek for Christ as a momentary, and not their everlasting, portion; therefore they fail to gain a

divine reality in either. Christ must be sought for as the pearl of great price; nothing else superior, nor standing in competition with him. He must be above all in value, and supreme in the affections of the heart, loved and worshiped as God. Godliness is not for a day, for the religious life, begun here, will be perpetuated to all eternity, unfolding itself and growing more intensely real and elevating in its infinite progress. How futile then for persons to strive for religion as the means of momentary enjoyment, or merely to fit the soul for the conflict of death, while it retains a greater good and a more worthy object. Christ and religion should not be sought for, merely to quiet the goadings of conscience and relieve from the terror of a violated law, but as objects equivalent to their greatest and best interests for all time, and for boundless eternity, in connection with the praise and glory of God.

Too many fail of religion, because they desire to put their self-righteousness into the scale with the righteousness of Christ, as the ground of *divine acceptance*. They do not wish to feel and confess their utter vileness, supreme emptiness and entire unworthiness. But so they really are; so God, the holy and infinitely wise and good, regards them; and so wretched and undone they must esteem and frankly confess themselves to be. The more clearly they see, that the whole heart is faint and sick, and the whole character one great putrifying sore, and that they have no soundness and moral goodness, wherewith to commend themselves to God, and that their only hope is in the righteousness of Christ, the brighter the prospect of their becoming eminent saints before God. "Let him that has no money, come and buy; yea, come buy wine and milk, without money and without price. Incline your ear and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live."

Many souls have wrecked on the rock of procrastination. What Christ said on another occasion, he utters into the ear of every sinner: "What thou doest, do quickly." Delays have often proved as disastrous to souls, as the ebbing tide to vessels well nigh in the harbor, carrying them back into the wide and stormy ocean, there tossed about by angry waves, and at last dashed into a wreck by frowning rocks. Some who were almost persuaded, and others not far from the kingdom of Christ, have been charmed by the syren song of folly, or entrapped by the wily snare of pleasure, or captivated by some empty pa-

geantry on the theatre of life, until ruin has overwhelmed them, and God shall, at last, laugh at their calamity, and mock when their destruction cometh as a whirlwind. Attend to what belongs to your everlasting peace, early and quickly! Break the fatal charm of false security and procrastination, and struggle into life!

Lastly, believe in Christ with the *whole heart*. He is worthy of such a reception. It is for your interest to love and worship him with your whole heart. Certainly he will accept nothing short of such an offering, for his throne must be set up and rest on the understanding, will and the affections. He will enter no soul and be excluded from one half; the whole must be surrendered, or he will turn away and seek dominion elsewhere. The washing of the water of life and purification, must be applied to your feet, head and whole body; the whole man is sin-polluted, and the whole has need of cleansing and salvation. As you are, you must come, with every sin and stain of guilt, with every rent shred of self-righteousness hanging on your soul, with all your wounds and blood, with all your poverty, emaciation and throbbing pulsations of your dying soul, and Christ will heal and save and restore you to perfect soundness. He will give health, vigor, hope and eternal life. Will you have this religion and accept the Lord's Anointed?

ARTICLE III.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD SELAH.

There has been a variety of opinions expressed in reference to the term *Selah*, but the subject is still involved in some obscurity. The meaning of this difficult word has not been clearly ascertained, or wholly determined. The results of all critical investigation so far present nothing entirely satisfactory, or fully certain, and only furnish an additional illustration of the fact, that the most learned men, the best Biblical scholars, of different ages and countries, may differ in their conclusions.

The term occurs seventy-one times in the Psalms, and three times in the Song of Habakkuk. In our English version the expression is never translated, but the original, *Selah*, is found. In the *Targum*, or Chaldee version, the word is rendered *Lealim*, *forever*, or *to eternity*, *eternally forever*. In the *Septuagint*, where it is more frequently found, and where it does not occur in the Hebrew, it is rendered διαλαμα, indicative, in the judgment of the translators, of some variation or modulation of the voice in singing, a change in the metre, or rhythmical note. In the *Vulgate*, the word is altogether omitted, as if it constituted no part of the sacred text.

Whilst most critics have united in the opinion, that the expression is, in some way, connected with music, these conjectures somewhat vary. Among the most plausible explanations that have been given, is that of the distinguished Oriental scholar, Gesenius, who regarded it as a musical term, expressive of silence, a rest or a pause, and that, in chanting the Psalms, its design was to direct the singer to be silent, to pause for a brief space, while the instruments played an interlude, or a harmony. According to his idea, the word, literally rendered, means, *Let the instruments strike up a symphony, and let the singer pause*. He also suggests, that it may be a *repeat*, and adds, that it is always connected with some highly important truth, demanding our earnest consideration and serious reflection.

Calmet maintains that the ancient Hebrew musicians introduced the word into the margins of the *Psalters*, to show where a musical pause or rest was to occur, and where the tune ended; just as in the manuscript copies of the gospels, solemnly read in the early ages of the Christian Church, the Greek word τέλος, or the Latin word *finis*, was written in the margin, either at length, or with a contraction, to designate the place where the reading of the scripture lesson was to terminate, at that time the divisions of the Bible into chapters and verses not having been made; or he thinks the ancient Hebrews sang in a manner, similar to the modern Arabians, with long pauses, ending all at once, and, therefore, it was requisite in the public services to indicate, in the margin of the Psalms, the end or the place of the pause, so that the whole choir might, at the same time, suspend their voice and recommence the singing.

Jerome was of the opinion, that the term connects that

which precedes in the text with that which succeeds, and supposed that the words, to which it is appended, are of eternal moment, applicable, not to any particular person, or temporary circumstances, but intended for all times and all men, and to be forever remembered.

Grotius regarded the expression as altogether a musical note, designed to convey the idea of emphasis, calling attention to some sentiment of more than ordinary importance, some truth of unusual magnitude, or special interest. He derived the word from the Hebrew *Salal* which means *to raise*, or *to ascend*, and implies the elevation of the voice in singing, as well as the lifting up of the heart to God in this devotional exercise, requiring the careful meditation of the truth presented, the solemn consideration of the lesson enjoined. Ewald has adopted the same opinion, and considers the word synonymous with *up*, *higher*, or *distinct*, taking, with Grotius, its derivation from the Hebrew word signifying *to elevate*. Worcher thought the term was nothing more than an equivalent for the Latin expression, *Sursum corda*, Up my soul.

Meibomius, Matheson, Jahn, Parkhurst and Wall supposed, that it was merely a musical tone, equivalent to the word repeat, and meant that the last words of the text were to be repeated as a chorus, always being introduced in connection with some pathetic passage, or some remarkable sentiment. According to Luther, the word signifies silence. By Tholuck and Hengstenberg, it, in connection with the expression *Higgaion*, found also in the Psalms, is rendered meditation, pause, meditative pause, in other words, "Let the singer meditate, or reflect, while the music stops." Aben Ezra, with many more, thinks that it indicates simply the conclusion of a prayer, similar to *Amen*, or a direct appeal to Jehovah, a solemn prayer for divine guidance, expressed with entire distinctness, or if not in the imperative *Hear Jehovah*, an earnest address to God, that he would mercifully remember the request presented. Aquila, Geier, Forster, Buxtorf, Rosenmüller and Herder, entertained the opinion, that the word has no signification, but that it is merely a musical note denoting a pause, or suspension of the voice, and is designed as a direction for the vocal performers, the precise use of which is no longer known.

With all these views presented, it may not seem easy to determine the exact meaning of the word, yet, even in the

diversity of opinion expressed, there is a remarkable coincidence among critics in the general explanations that have been given on the subject. The conclusions which, we think, may be safely adopted are:

1. That the word is a musical notation, or musical term, and was used in connection with musical instruments. As it is found only in poetry, the inference seems most probable, that it had something to do with the singing of the poetry; that it indicates a pause in the performance, or a change in the melody, and was intended to give some direction to the singer to be silent, or to rest a little, while the instruments played an interlude. This opinion is strengthened by the fact, that the omission of the word, in no instance, interrupts the connection, or impairs the sense of the text.

2. That the musical pause invariably corresponds with the pause in the sense of the passage, and that it is inserted in those places, in which the pause in the sense renders it suitable. The word is designed as a mark of observation, pointing out some thought, well worthy of the deepest consideration, commanding him who read or sang, to pause and meditate, as if some sentiment peculiarly important or solemn had been uttered, to revolve in his mind with great seriousness the matter placed before him. *Mark that, or stop there, and consider a little.* It may be intended as a caution, or admonition, to the reader to reflect on what he reads, equivalent to the language of the Saviour, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." This view is confirmed, because it is found (Ps. 9 : 16) in connection with the word *Higgaion*, which signifies meditation. The word *Selah* may, in some cases, seem to be used where the word, or verse, which precedes cannot be regarded as particularly emphatic, yet it may be applicable, not only to the word or verse immediately preceding, but likewise to the series of verses or periods, with which it stands connected.

3. That the word may mean nothing more than a fervent ejaculation, indicative of the writer's pious emotions, a personal address to the Author of every good and perfect gift. It may be intended as a significant and solemn pause, calling us to exalt and magnify the name of God. It may be an expression, similar to our word *Hallelujah*, *Praise ye the Lord.* This is entirely appropriate to the dignity and design of devotional music, in which the vo-

cal and instrumental performers are reminded of their sacred duty, the solemn object of prayer and praise, in which all are earnestly summoned to adore and magnify the name, the perfections, the excellencies and the works of the Triune Jehovah, the only true God.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GOOD ANGELS.

By Prof. H. LOUIS BAUGHER, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

Common as it is to speak of *Angels*, both in public discourse and ordinary conversation, it is yet a rare thing to hear this subject *discussed*, and to find any one having intelligent, well-defined views of it. The reason of this may be the difficulty of the subject, from our want of sources of knowledge, or a sort of infidelity regarding the *real* existence and agency of Angels, or, perhaps, more than either of these, a want of thought in the matter.

It seems reasonable, however, that a careful study of any thing of which the Sacred Scriptures are so full, must be attended with absorbing interest as well as practical benefit. If "all Scripture is profitable for instruction," &c., that which is written concerning the angels must be so. Angels have had so much to do with the past history of this earth; so important a part is allotted to them in prophecy for the future; and their condition is so suggestive of what our order will be when the fashion of this world shall have passed away, that we cannot well afford to lose the instruction and comfort which a contemplation of this theme offers.

All our knowledge concerning the Angels comes from Revelation. The subject affords a wide and tempting field for fanciful speculation, but all that we *know* about it, is what God has told us. In former days there were those who had knowledge of angels by sensible intercourse with them, but, in our time, it seems, if these beings are entertained at all, it is "*unawares*." The record of the experience of patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, to

whom angels appeared, has, however, been given for our benefit.

The word translated "Angel," in both the Old and New Testaments, means *messenger*. It is sometimes used of merely human beings. (Is 42 : 19; Mal. 2 : 7; 3 : 1; Matt. 11 : 10; Luke 7 : 24; 9 : 52.)

In many passages, especially in the oldest books of the Bible, the phrase "Angel of the Lord" is generally interpreted to mean God himself, and, as special manifestations of Divinity, the appearances therein described are thought to foreshadow the Incarnation. (Gen. 16 : 7; 22 : 11, 12; Ex. 3 : 2, *et seq.*) As most frequently used, the term "Angel" is applied to an order of beings distinct from, and superior to mankind, yet finite. These beings are also distinguished from the saints in glory. It is a common notion that, when the good die, they become *Angels*: and children are taught to sing, "I want to be an Angel," &c. This may do for poetry, but in our doctrine we must discriminate, according to the Scriptures, between "the spirits of just men made perfect," and the "innumerable company of Angels." Ransomed sinners shall be "equal unto the Angels," (ἰσαγγελοι, Luke 20 : 36,) but will still be distinct from them.

The Scriptures give us two general classes of Angels, and we usually call them the good and the bad, the former class embracing those that maintained the character and position given them at the beginning, and the latter made up of those that "kept not their first estate." (Jude 6; Matt. 25 : 41; Rev. 12 : 7, 9.)

This article proposes to treat only of the Good Angels; and with this explanation of terms we are ready to inquire more particularly, *Who* are the Angels? They are not emanations of God—the *ÆONS* of the Persian philosophy—but *created* beings, the highest in rank known to us. Both reason and revelation refer us back to only one uncreated, self-existent being—God. To him, in the person of Christ, is ascribed the creation of everything else. "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," Col. 1 : 16. Of course this includes the angels, for they belong to the "invisible" "things that are in heaven;" and the terms "thrones, dominions," &c., can refer to nothing else than the different orders of Angels.

The Angels are not a race, descended one from another, like man. (Luke 20 : 36.) So far as we know, each one is an immediate creation of God. The priority of their creation is affirmed by Jehovah in an address to Job, (38 : 7,) in which he calls them "morning stars" and "sons of God," and represents them as singing together and shouting for joy, at the laying of the foundations of the earth.

Angels are *spiritual* beings, *i. e.*, not *sensual*; and here the question arises, *Have they bodies?* 'Tis certain they have appeared to men in a bodily shape, and *in human form*. They are represented as having hands and feet and a countenance; as standing, sitting, coming and going in an ordinary way, as eating, drinking, singing, etc. The Angels that appeared to Abraham and Lot, are thus spoken of (Gen. 18 : 19): "Lo, *three men* stood by him (*i. e.*, Abraham); and when he saw them he *ran to meet them* * and said: Let a little water be fetched, and *wash your feet* and *rest yourselves under the tree*. * * And *they did eat*" of the repast provided for them. "And the men rose up and looked toward Sodom, and Abraham *went with them*, to bring them on the way." So Lot, when he saw the Angels, *as men*, coming to Sodom, "rose up to meet them," and tendered them the hospitalities of his house, which, when they refused, "he pressed upon them greatly," till they complied and went into his house and *ate of the feast* which Lot prepared. When Lot went out to reason with the Sodomites, who had gathered about his door to offer violence to the strangers, it is said of the Angels: "And *the men* put forth *their hand* and pulled Lot into the house to them;" and, afterwards, when he lingered in the city devoted to destruction, "the men laid hold *upon his hand*, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters," and brought them forth.

So Gideon (Judges 6 : 11,) saw an Angel of the Lord *sitting under an oak with a staff in his hand*, and having altogether the appearance of a man, so that Gideon at first thought him to be no more than a prophet.

Another very interesting account, of the appearance of an Angel to Manoah's wife, (Samson's mother,) is contained in Judges xiii. From it we gather that, though the countenance of the man was so striking as to make her think of "an Angel of God," yet, neither she, nor her husband, had any suspicion that this was really such a being, until he had departed. They, however, were anxious to

show him hospitality, they made ready a feast for his refreshment, asked his name, spoke of him as merely "*a man of God*," and treated him as such. Let it be observed, too, that, when the Angel appeared a second time, in answer to Manoah's prayer to let him come again, his wife *recognized* him as the *same* person that had appeared to her before: this teaching us, that the Angel had features of countenance, which remained the same. So astonished was Manoah, when he found that this, whom he took for a fellow mortal, was a real *Angel*, that he was alarmed lest he should die.

Daniel, (8 : 15, *et seq.*) speaking of Gabriel, and knowing that he was an Angel, describes him as "*the appearance of a man*," calls him "*the man Gabriel*," and speaks of his *touching* him. Of a second appearance of the same messenger, he says: "The man Gabriel whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning * * touched me," &c., from which again we infer that Daniel *recognized* in the Angel *the same features*, as at first. The Angels at the tomb of the risen Saviour, are described as *young men* in white, or shining, *garments*; (Mark 16 : 5; Luke 24 : 4;) and so of those that appeared at Christ's ascension. (Acts 1 : 10.)

By these Scripture statements, we are assured that Angels *have* had *bodies*, and that these were like human bodies. Yet, still the question remains unanswered, whether they are, *by nature*, embodied spirits. For, it may be, on the occasions referred to, their form and appearance were *assumed* only for the time being. Still we ask, *Have Angels bodies?*

Our conclusion will be aided by considering what is said of the resurrection-body of believers, and of Christ's glorified body. See 1 Cor. 15. "There is a *natural* body," we are told, "and there is a *spiritual* body; howbeit, that is not *first* which is spiritual, but that which is *natural*; and *afterward* that which is spiritual." The body that is laid in the grave is natural and corruptible; that which is *raised* from it, is *spiritual* and *incorruptible*. They who are alive at the coming of Christ, shall not *die*, nor can we believe they will lose, or part, with their bodies, but, as the apostle expresses it, "We shall be *changed*;" alike in the case of living and dead, "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality." Now, all that is corruptible and mortal in man, is his *body*; this

body, then, plainly must undergo a wonderful change, yet remain a *body* still. Christ, answering the Sadducean objectors to the resurrection, says (Luke 20 : 35): "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the Angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Now, the point in dispute, here, was concerning the *body*; and when Christ says of the resurrected saints, that they shall be equal unto—or, as it is perhaps better translated, "*like unto*" the Angels,—the manifest interpretation is, that they shall be like them in *body*; hence we must infer that the Angels have bodies, to which the raised bodies of believers may be likened. In this connection it is interesting to notice that Christ gives to "the children of the resurrection" the very same name that Jehovah, in the beginning, gave to the Angels, viz.: "*Sons of God*."

Here, then, our question is answered. Yet we may gain some further light, from our knowledge of the Saviour's glorified body. We know that he arose with the same body that was crucified, (Jno. 20 : 20, 27,) and with that body he ascended, and is now seated at the right hand of God. The properties of Christ's risen body were superior to those possessed by him before his death. Thus, walls and barred doors were no hindrance to its motion: the Saviour's rising body experienced no hindrance from the stone walls of the sepulchre—*He* had no need to have the stone rolled away from the door of the sepulchre—nor, afterwards, was he impeded by the closed doors of the room where the disciples were assembled; suddenly he appeared in their midst, and as quickly "vanished out of their sight." (Luke 24 : 31; Jno. 20 : 19, 26.) Whilst the disciples were standing around him, all at once he rose, unrestrained by the power of gravitation, and ascended till he was out of sight. (Acts 1 : 9—11.) May we not conclude that such are some of the powers belonging to risen and glorified bodies, and have we not here some clue as to the nature of angelic bodies? From Gideon and Manoah (see refs. above) the Angels ascended in a similar way, in their very sight; and to Peter, shut up in prison walls, the Angel of the Lord came in unhindered by obstacles made for the very purpose of debarring ordinary bodies. (Acts 12.)

When Christ shall appear, "we shall be *like him*;" he will "change our vile *body* that it may be *fashioned like unto his glorious body*." (Phil. 3 : 21 ; 1 John 3 : 2.) Speaking of Adam and Christ as our prototypes, the apostle says: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." These things, taken in connection with the Saviour's statement that after the resurrection the saints shall be *as*, or *like unto*, the Angels, are instructive lessons, both as to our own, future condition, and as to the present state of the Angels. From all which preceding statements, we conclude that Angels are the highest order of created beings, pure spirits, yet possessed of glorious bodies, which, however their properties may differ from and surpass any bodies with which we have acquaintance, are nevertheless truly and properly called *bodies*.

What is the *appearance* of the Angels? Reasoning from analogy, we would *suppose* Angels would as far surpass man in noble mien and glory, as man surpasses the rest of the terrestrial creation; and, as the attendants of a king share his state and set it forth, so the train of the Great King should have and appear with a glorious dignity, becoming Him on whom they wait; that, as the moon and stars reflect the light of the sun around which they revolve, so these "morning stars," that circle around the great spotless Sun that has lighted all, should gleam with his dazzling majesty, that these "sons of God" should bear, in some degree, the glorious lineaments of their Great Father. The face of Moses, when he came down from communing with God on the Mount, so shone that the children of Israel could not look upon it; what, then, shall we infer of the faces of those who see God in his undimmed majesty? There are many reasons why, in their visits to earth, the glory of the Angels should be veiled from human eyes: yet there have been some manifestations which we may regard as faint outlines of the reality, patterns of things in the heavens. Matthew (28 : 3) says of the Angel that rolled away the stone from the door of the sepulchre, "His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow." When the Angel of the Lord appeared to the shepherds, (Luke 2 : 9,) there shone round about them the glory of the Lord. When the Angel appeared to Peter in prison, (Acts. 12 : 7,) "a light shined" therein; and what light was it but the heavenly

radiance of the messenger? Of Stephen, on his trial, the sacred penman (Acts 6 : 15) says, "And all that sat in the Council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been *the face of an Angel*."

Compare the account of the Transfiguration, when Christ's "face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light" (Matt. 17 : 2), and of that exceeding brightness that struck to the earth Paul and his company, when the Lord Jesus appeared to him on the road to Damascus (Acts 9); and see the description, in the Apocalypse, (1 : 13, *et seq.*) of "one like unto the Son of Man," that appeared to John: and from these representations get an *intimation* of the glorious appearance of the Angels; for, "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly."

Time makes an impression on man's features; not only an impression of development, but also of decay; his beauty fades, his eye grows dim, his brow wrinkles, he gets *old* and *feels old*. Has eternity any similar effect on the Angels? Do *they* become *old*? They certainly receive impressions and *increase* in knowledge (1 Pet. 1 : 12, *et alt.*); there is development; but why should there be age among creatures that have never sinned, that have no sentence of death written in their members? What is age but death coming on apace? What is it that fades the beautiful form, dims the radiant eye, wrinkles the placid brow and changes strength to weakness, what is it but sin that makes us *old*? It is the tardy execution of the sentence "Thou shalt surely die."

"It is not time that flies;
'Tis we, 'tis we are flying:
It is not life that dies;
'Tis we, 'tis we are dying.

Time and Eternity are one;
Time is Eternity begun:
Life changes, yet without decay;
'Tis we alone who pass away."

There is no fading among the blessed spirits that never lost their title to immortality. Theirs is immortal youth, eternal brightness, unfailing vigor. The Angels who appeared at the sepulchre, though at least four thousand years old, were still "*young men*!"

With reference to the *movements* of Angels from place to place, it has already been said that the progress of the spiritual, heavenly body, is most probably not impeded by obstructions that hinder the free motion of earthly bodies. The use of the term "to fly," in connection with them, does not necessarily imply that they have *wings*. That notion was first advanced by an Egyptian priest. The scriptural representations which make them to have wings, sometimes two, and sometimes more, seem to be, for the most part, *symbolical*, and intended to teach the celerity of their movements.

Christ ascended through the air without any apparent aid but *his own will*; and it is said of the raised saints at Christ's coming, that they shall, along with those who shall then be living on earth, "be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." (1 Thess. 4 : 17.)

The Angel that appeared to Manoaah "ascended," before his eyes, "in the flame of the altar." With such facility may these beings come and go between heaven and earth, and from one world to another in the universe. That they move with the utmost speed, we infer from Daniel 9 : 20—23, where we read: "And while I was speaking and praying and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, * * * yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, *being caused to fly swiftly*, touched me about the time of the evening oblation, * * * and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. *At the beginning of thy supplications* the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee," &c. While the light from yonder North Star is thirty *years* in coming to this earth, an Angel from the very presence of God, who is "*far above all heavens*," starts from that sublime abode at the *beginning of a man's prayer*, and reaches him *before he has finished*; thus, Angels outstrip the light, in the celerity of their movements.

What are we taught of the *power* of these beings? St. Peter (2d Epistle 2 : 11) says they "are greater in power and might" than mankind. The Psalmist says (103 : 20) they excel in strength." In the Apocalypse (7 : 1; 18 : 1; 20 : 2) they are represented as "holding the four winds," "having great power," laying "hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil," and casting him, bound with a great chain, into the bottomless pit. These heroes

of heaven have power to execute the commands of Jehovah. There is, however, *a difference in degree* among them, as is clearly taught by the names under which they are spoken of—Cherubim and Seraphim, Angels and Archangels, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers. (Col. 1 : 16 ; 1 Pet. 3 : 22, *et alt.*) Only two individual names of Angels are given in Scripture—MICHAEL, (Jude 9 ; Rev. 12 : 7,) and GABRIEL. (Dan. 9 : 21 ; Luke 1 : 19, 26.) They evidently occupy an exalted station.

What is the *number* of the Angels? It is accordant with our ideas that, in everything, the retinue of the King of kings should be of surpassing magnificence : and such it is ; even in *number* it is beyond our calculation. Paul speaks of them as an “innumerable company.” (Heb. 12 : 22.) Daniel (7 : 10) had a vision, of which he says : “I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit. * * * Thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him ;” and St. John (Rev. 5 : 11) says, “I beheld and I heard the voice of *many Angels* round about the throne ; * * * and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands.” From this we learn *where* the proper place of these glorious beings is—“round about the throne ;” waiting attendants on the “Ancient of Days ;” having, as the place of their departure on, and return from, their manifold missions to the corners of the universe, the very seat of the Most High. They are citizens of the “highest heavens.”

What shall we say of their *knowledge*? From their character and position, we infer it must be far beyond that of man. They are the highest finite intelligences. How they acquire knowledge, we know not ; but, as they are every way superior to mankind, it is reasonable to suppose they have powers of communicating with each other and with the rest of the creation, of receiving and imparting ideas, far above any thing with which we are acquainted. Besides, they are in the immediate presence of God, to learn continually from, and of, the source of all knowledge. Christ, speaking of the Day of Judgment, says (Matt. 24 : 36): “But of that day and hour knoweth no man, *no, not the Angels of heaven ;*” from which we certainly are justified in inferring that, in most things, the Angels of heaven have a greater knowledge than we. We are authorized in thinking them acquainted with the his-

tory of mankind, as it transpires, and deeply concerned therein. The *fall* of our first parents must have been known to them, for it was cherubim that guarded the tree of life after their expulsion from Eden: they probably knew the curse that had been pronounced; and when the spirit of the first martyr, Abel—the first that ever died—entered into rest, and when Enoch and Methuselah and Noah and the Patriarchs, were given places in the kingdom of God, instead of being forever banished from his presence, the Angels saw that mercy and truth had met together, righteousness and peace had kissed each other. Here were the workings of the redemptive scheme before their eyes, and whilst, perhaps, they could not comprehend it, yet these were the things into which, above all, they desired to look. This their desire was, we suppose, gradually gratified until they understood that for the salvation of sinners it was necessary for the King of Heaven himself to humble himself to be born of a woman. In accordance with this view, we find an angelic messenger announcing the “good tidings” of the Saviour’s birth, and, with him, a multitude of the heavenly host praising God for the glorious consequences which were to flow from the incarnation of Christ. (Luke 1 and 2.) It was the wondrous privilege of Angels to minister to him in the desert, (Matt. 4 : 11,) and to strengthen him in his agony (Luke 22 : 43); and when the climax of man’s wickedness was reached, in the crucifixion of his Lord and Saviour—a scene upon which the sun refused to look—is it any stretch of imagination to suppose that the voices of the heavenly host were stilled, and their fingers refused to strike the golden harps, and there was silence in heaven, its holy inhabitants struck dumb with amaze and wonder! And, if the eyes of men had been opened, they might have seen a stronger guard than that of the Romans, stretching from the holy sepulchre up to heaven; and what a shout of glory must have resounded through the arches of heaven, when they saw him triumph over death and come out of the tomb a conqueror; and while it echoes through the sky, some of them appear to the faithful women, to tell them and his disciples that “He is risen.” Forty days after this he ascended into heaven; and, as the Angels sang his natal song and watched, with deepening interest, his life and death and resurrection, so, with hallelujahs such as ear hath never heard, must they have welcomed back

him who, having been "made a little lower than the Angels for the suffering of death," was now exalted to receive "a name above every name." Who can conceive the scene when the heavenly gates were "lift up," and the everlasting doors were thrown open wide, that the Lord of Hosts, the King of Glory might come in!

If the Angels were interested in our world before, how much more so now, since for it Christ has died! What amazement must seize them at the horrible wickedness of earth; and with what concern they must watch the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom! The *Church* is the *body* of Christ, "the *fulness* of him that filleth all in all;" and Paul (Eph. 3 : 10) tells us it is God's purpose to make known to "the principalities and powers in heavenly places, *by the Church*, the manifold wisdom of God;" that wisdom which was "hidden" from men and Angels, but is now manifested to both. God, therefore, is now showing to the Angels, who delight in learning more and more of his character, and will continue to show them, "in the ages to come, the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us." (Eph. 2 : 7).

It has been said that these inhabitants of heaven know something, perhaps much, of things transpiring on earth, and of people's characters. Are the apostles of Christ "set forth as it were appointed to death?" This is a spectacle to Angels. (1 Cor. 4 : 9.) Are sinners converted to God? Then "there is *joy in the presence of the Angels of God* over one sinner that repenteth." (Luke 15 : 10.)

It remains to inquire what is the *employment* of the Angels. We may not conceive of their being *idle*, nor as merely singing God's praise continually. *All* their *activities* are engaged in his service. Perhaps there is something for each one of them to do, the doing of which is their delight. We are taught to pray, "Thy will be done in earth *as it is in heaven*." They "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word;" they are "ministers of his, that do his pleasure." (Psalm 103 : 20, 21.) In sacred history we find some of them keeping the way of the Tree of Life; some of them, before God's Word was written and well known, declaring his will; the Law itself was "ordained by Angels, in the hand of a Mediator:" we find some of them executing his purposes of mercy, and others fulfilling his counsels of wrath. There seems to be no occasion now for Angels to declare God's

will, since we have it so fully revealed in the Bible: nor does it appear that they come among men *visibly*, as formerly; perhaps because this is a dispensation in which we walk by faith, not by sight. Yet the Angels are still the agents of God's special providence. As the servant of Elisha (2 Kings 6 : 17), when his eyes were "opened," saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha, so, are we not justified in believing, if our eyes were opened, we would see the saints encircled with attending guards from the army of heaven—especially in times of danger or fear? "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. 1 : 14.) "The Angel of the Lord," says David (Ps. 34 : 7), "*encampeth* round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." They who had charge over Christ (Ps. 91 : 11) to bear him up in their hands, lest he dash his foot against a stone, have charge also over those that are Christ's. If one "like the Son of God" was with the three captive Hebrews in the midst of the burning fiery furnace (Daniel 3 : 25), are not similar heavenly attendants with the saints now, when Satan casts them into a furnace burning hot with affliction and temptation? The Angels that carried Lazarus into Abraham's bosom must have been waiting for him when he died! Yes, "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints," and are we not justified, by both Scripture and experience, in saying that, on such occasions, especially, these ministering spirits of heaven are hovering around the good, waiting to conduct their unfettered souls to his divine abode and welcome home a soul, over whose conversion they before were made glad? Dying saints see more than living ones; while the natural eye grows dim, and ordinary objects fade from sight, another eye seems to open, spiritual vision begins, and things before *unseen* (though as real) open to the view. Then, as of old, the Angels of God are seen ascending and descending upon the sons of men. Of such experience the record goes, that one, whose dimmed eyes were closing on common scenes, beheld unusual objects, and he began to tell: "I *see* ——" but either the things seen were too much for human tongue to tell, or heaven forbade their utterance; but, thus much the bystanders knew, that that dying saint was beholding what, commonly, "eye hath not seen:" his eyes were *opening*! Yes, if our eyes were not holden, we could see these min-

istering spirits as they go, "sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." There are sweet consolations from such a thought, which belong to the heirs of such grace. Let faith appropriate them.

There is a scene in the future, in which every reader of this article must figure, along with all mankind. "The Son of Man shall come in his glory and *all the holy Angels with him.*" (Matt. 25 : 31.) After the Seed-time and Summer of the world, will come the Harvest, "And the Reapers are the Angels: (Matt. 13 : 39 :) And they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." When every man shall receive according to his deeds, it will be in the presence of the Angels of God; and they will be witnesses of Christ's confession of his friends and denial of his enemies: and the society of the redeemed in heaven will be composed of God, the saints, and all the holy Angels.

ARTICLE V.

HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR WORSHIP?*

By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.

The order of service in the new "Church Book," prescribes, that we enter upon our worship, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." All will readily agree that this is right. It is written: "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus," Col. 3 : 17; and if, in everything we undertake, we should have reference to the Master whom we serve, much more should we enter upon the solemn acts of worship with a direct and expressed reference to the God whom we propose to honor, on whose appointments we are about to proceed, and on whose gracious help we are dependent for the ability to perform the duty aright.

* Continued from p. 94—January No. 1869.

And as it is God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who is our God, the object of our adoration, the Being contemplated in the whole service, and the Divine Majesty, whose bidding we would obey, and whose favor we would seek, reason and Scripture unite in requiring that every instance of such an august transaction should proceed upon this acknowledgment, either expressed or understood. And if the act is to be in all respects complete, and the basis, upon which we proceed, is to be duly recognized, nothing can be more appropriate, edifying and necessary, than that the thing should be declared at the very outstart. And in no way can it be done better than in exactly those words, commanded by the Lord Jesus himself, when he sent forth his ambassadors to make disciples of all nations. Matt. 28 : 19.

There is, accordingly, great meaning in those opening words. They are few, but they are mighty. They give the key-note of the whole piece, the foundation of the whole edifice. They tell out by whose authority we do these solemn things, to whose honor they are all intended, and on whom we rest for the grace and hope in which we thus propose to edify ourselves and each other. And so momentous are the implications, that it is necessary for each worshipper to recognize the formula, and to make it his own. He must be able to say *Amen* to it, and heartily agree, that things shall proceed upon this basis, and in this spirit; or he cannot hope that his worship will be owned and approved. A mental acquiescence may answer; but, as "from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and as a distinct expression of a feeling, or thought, helps greatly to fix and deepen it, so it is provided that each one shall take hold of the solemn announcement, and link himself with it, by a formal, and personally spoken, "*Amen*."

That such a form of uniting in the utterances of worship was observed in the apostolic churches, and sanctioned by their inspired leaders, is proved to us by the Scriptures themselves. Thus Paul, in reproving the Corinthians for their disorderly use of the gift of tongues in their assemblies, demanding of them to adhere to the language understood by the people: "Else," says he, "when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say the *Amen* (*τὸ ἀμὴν*) at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest," 1 Cor. 14 : 16. It had been an old ordinance, that the

people should ratify the priest's announcement of God's truth by the saying of the Amen. So in Deuteronomy 27 : 14-26, we find it twelve times said: "And all the people shall answer and say, Amen." So, also, in Nehemiah (8 : 6) it is written, that "Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God, and all the people answered, Amen, Amen." So, too, in John's vision of the worship in heaven, when the universal song went up, of "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb," "the four living ones said, Amen." Rev. 5 : 13, 14. The highest origin, authority and sanction, therefore, belong to the use of the Amen, as a formula for joining one's self to the worship, and to the particular acts of it, so as to make them heartily one's own. Justin Martyr tells us, that it was the established custom in his day; and the testimony of Paul is decisive, that it was the same in the churches he established. Nay, his specific direction was, that reference should be had to an intelligent saying of "the Amen" in all that should be done by the leaders of the worship; to which also he set the seal of his apostolic authority, saying: "The things I write, are the commandments of God." 1 Cor. 14 : 37. In the Psalms, also, it stands written, when the Lord God of Israel is blessed: "Let all the people say, Amen." Ps. 106 : 48.

Having, then, put ourselves in position to approach God, and assumed the attitude of reverence and service, it is in place that we should hear something to warrant and encourage that approach. No one can draw near to God without regard to some Divine word or assurance, that it is lawful, acceptable and promising of good so to do. We cannot approach even one another, without some understood assurance on which we build our belief that we may safely do it; and much more is such an encouragement necessary to warrant us in coming before the Lord. And in order that the matter may not be left unexpressed or doubtful, it is prescribed that the encouragement shall be officially given, and in the very words of the inspired apostles: "Let us draw near with a true heart." Heb. 10 : 22. Thus the congregation, being disposed to move toward God, is met with the word of God, inviting it to proceed. It is not man's invitation, but the invitation of the Almighty himself, which he has given to his servants to speak to all who have a mind for communion with him. By the opening words, sealed with the Amen, the congregation

takes shelter under the name and authority of the Triune God—stations itself in the Lord, under cover of his name, by his appointment, and for his glory. Hence the people are next addressed as “Beloved in the Lord;” and God’s authorized word is spoken to them, that they may take confidence, and go forward with what is in their hearts.

But, wherewith shall we come before the Lord? What offering make? What sacrifice bring? What ceremonies observe? Under the Old Testament, no one was accepted, unless he offered sacrifice, and confessed and atoned for his sins, by the shedding of the victim’s blood. No one could enter the holy sanctuary without this. But these ancient sacrifices have all been done away by the offering of the great sacrifice of Jesus on the cross; to whom all the ancient sacrifices pointed, and from which they derived their virtue. The true sacrifice now, is a broken and a contrite heart; a heart conscious of, and penitent for, its sins, and anxious to be forgiven, through the merits of Jesus, who was sacrificed for us. “Thus saith the Lord, To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.” Is. 66 : 1, 2. And so the apostle has written: “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” 1 Jno. 1 : 9. And as there can be no reconciliation with God without repentance, so there can be no acceptable worship without an acknowledgment of our unworthiness and guilt, and an earnest seeking of forgiveness through him, who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification. This, then, must necessarily be included in every act of approach to God. And especially in the high and formal deed of a whole assembly drawing near to the Almighty, it is neither safe nor proper to leave so vital a matter to the uncertainties of private understanding. It should, in all reason, be distinctly and fully expressed. It is not enough merely to assume that we are sinners, but we must *confess* that we are sinners, and *declare* the plea on which we rest, and through which alone we can hope to stand before God.

And if there is to be any formal acknowledgment of our sins, any expression of penitence for our guilt, any putting forward of our wish and plea for pardon, there is every reason for making this the very first act in the service. It is the first act in the order of salvation. It is the first

impulse, which the soul feels when it is awakened to a right sense of God. It was the first and uppermost thing in the thoughts and resolves of the prodigal, as he came to himself, and determined to come back to his father's house. And as there must be baptism for the remission of sins, before there can be the supper of communion and fellowship with Jesus, so the penitential acknowledgment of sin, and the humble seeking of its removal, through Jesus Christ, must precede those higher acts of confidence and liberty before God, to which our worship is meant to grow. Jesus himself has commanded, when we are invited to a feast, to go and sit down first "in the lowest room," until the Master of the house shall bid us "go up higher." And, in the very nature of the thing, which is not so much worship, in the proper sense, as a step in the way of preparation, for worship, we have the indication, that this should occur right here, as the very first particular to be attended to after we have disposed ourselves to draw near to God.

Accordingly, with the encouragement to draw near, is joined *the exhortation* to make confession of our sins unto God, our Father, beseeching him, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to grant us forgiveness. It is not man's word, but God's; as it is written: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Is. 65: 7. "Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord, and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you: for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger forever. Only acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God." Jer. 3: 12, 13. "Now, therefore make confession unto the Lord God of your fathers, and do his pleasure." Ezra 10: 11.

And in proceeding to make such public confession, it is meet, right and necessary, that both minister and people should recur to the promises, and encourage themselves by the word of God, and the experience of his saints of old. Hence the admirably chosen selections—the Adjutorium and Versicle—with which the act of confession is prefaced. By these the attention is turned back again to the foundation of our hope; and the declaration is made afresh of what we rest on. None but inspired words are used. With the Psalmist we say: "Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth." Ps. 124: 8.

And to his successful example we refer, where he declares: "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Ps. 32 : 5. It is also necessary to an intelligent and acceptable confession of our sins, that we should proceed to it with exactly such a mental state as these selections express. That state may, indeed, exist without specific expression, and it may be expressed in other words and ways, but certainly not more scripturally, more briefly, or more completely, than in the mode and terms here prescribed. And as the object of a written formula is, to secure an embodied utterance of all the vital elements of worship, these items have a practical and devotional worth, which the Church has felt, and which exalts them far above any mere ornamentation of the service. They are words fitly set, and fill an office, which well entitles them to the place assigned them.

The act of confession itself is begun and led by the minister, as the representative and head of the assembly; but having humbly stated the facts, he is then audibly joined by each worshipper; and on the basis of the acknowledgment just made, all unite, or should unite, in one combined plea for forgiveness and grace, for Christ's sake.

The confession is, necessarily a general one, in which all classes, old and young, can equally join. Our Articles maintain, that it is neither necessary, nor possible, for men to enumerate all their sins; neither would it be right to make acknowledgment of offences, of which many may be innocent. It is a common vice of extemporaneous prayer, that it is apt to say too much, and to make representations to God, which are misrepresentations, in which it is impossible for all to acquiesce. But, that we are all sinful beings, individually and collectively, there can be no question. Each one of us is a member of a sinful race, and has many a time offended. We were conceived and born in sin, and we have all "sinned by thought, word and deed." If any one is not willing to confess this, he cannot come to forgiveness and eternal life. There is no necessity for the multiplication of words; and any form which adequately expresses the facts, may answer; but the thing itself must be done, and in no way curtailed in substance, from the formulas laid down in our service. They are pure; they are scriptural; they are brief; they are comprehensive; and no real improvement upon them has yet been made, or can be. They are just that, to

which no true Christian worshipper can decline to say, *Amen*; and just that, in which a public confession of sin is properly and fully made, without useless length as to words, and without disabling abridgment as to substance. They accurately describe each one's condition, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken away. They unequivocally set out the only ground, upon which forgiveness is possible, and upon which there is hope for man. And they energetically put forward and hold up before God the imploring plea, for what our situation and our salvation require.

Having thus complied with the encouraging direction, drawn near *with a true heart*, confessed our sins unto God, our Father, and thus earnestly besought him, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to grant us forgiveness, it is also orderly and right, that there should be an official utterance of those gospel treasures, which by covenant belong to the true penitent, through Christ Jesus. Our confession to God, is met with a declaration of favor from him. And this occurs in the *Absolution*, which is nothing more nor less than a summary statement of the sure promises of the gospel to such as do truly seek the forgiveness of their sins.

There is nothing more sure than this, that God hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked,—that he hath so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life,—that the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth from all sin,—that mercy and pardon are provided and given to every one that believeth,—and that the faithfulness and justice of God are pledged for the forgiveness of every one who does truly confess his transgressions. Equally certain is it, that the very office and appointment of the ministry, is to publish and declare these things to the children of men. They are the gospel, and this gospel is to be preached to every creature, and is specially to be spoken to distressed consciences and penitent hearts. That minister is derelict in the very highest function of his commission, who fails in this particular. It is the very essence of the ministerial command thus, in the name of God, to bind and loose, and to remit and retain sins, uttering to the penitent the absolution which God has given and commissioned him to speak to such, and to the wicked the condemnation and warning which God has

given and commissioned him to speak against the impenitent. And when the minister has before him a whole congregation of penitents, unreservedly and heartily confessing their sins and their earnest desire to be forgiven on the very terms that it is his business to declare forgiveness, it is demanded, by every aspect in which the subject can be viewed, that here certainly he should not be silent as to the chief substance and intent, for which he holds his office. Somewhere in the service he must speak God's forgiveness to the penitent, or he fails to fulfil his commission, and is a most unfaithful servant; and here is a marked occasion and call for it, to comfort and counsel the hearts of the contrite ones, who have just uttered their earnest cries for what God has given him to declare. Our service, therefore, prescribes, that *here he shall say it*.

And that it may be rightly and fully said, and in the fewest and most fitting words, the formula is supplied. Not any carelessly constructed language will answer in a point of such moment. It is the dearest interest of distressed and anxious souls that is involved, in what he is to say. He is to speak that, upon which all the eternal hopes and comforts of men are depending. He must not say too much, lest he should give hope where it cannot truthfully be taken; and he must not say too little, lest he should not give the comfort which Christ has commanded him to give. Nor is there, in all his ministerial duty, a more delicate, or a more momentous office, than just this of setting forth to souls, penitentially seeking the Divine favor, what they may rest on, and how far they may take to themselves consolation of hope. In this, then, if in anything, it is due that there should be the most careful weighing of words, and a most devout digest and condensation of the whole gospel into a few befitting expressions, upon which faith may safely seize, and to which hope may securely cling.

And this is exactly what is realized in the words of *Ab-solution*, as given in our Service. The most pregnant statements of the Scriptures on the subject, are gathered into one clear and full declaration, which beams with light, and truth, and hope, pouring its comforting and assuring rays over the whole assembly, and into every believing heart. Like a voice from heaven itself, which it really is, it comes to us, setting out to each the great gospel consolation: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, hath had

mercy upon us, and for the sake of his dear Son, forgiveth us all our sins;" and that "to them that believe on his name, he also giveth power to become the sons of God, and bestoweth upon them his Holy Spirit." All of which is sealed and confirmed by the direct words of the Lord Jesus himself, where he says: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Whereupon, in one intense prayer, to which each joins himself by the personally spoken *Amen*, the heart is thrown open to what is declared, and the hands of faith lay hold of "this salvation."

Thus far, however, we have been occupied only with the preparations for worship, rather than with the worship itself. Everything, from the very first word and act, is worship, and grasps into itself many of the same elements which run through the entire service; but nothing in it is so purely, and in so high a sense, that communion with God, or that sublime adoration and enjoyment of him, which pertains to a child of God in sacred converse with his heavenly Father. Our entire service, according to the nature of Christian life and all Godward movements, is progressive, and has various steps and stages. It begins with the lowest, the depths of contrition, and advances from one degree to another, till every point in a complete Christian worship is covered, and the whole is crowned in the holy communion, and the closing Benediction. And until we have confessed and repented of our sins, and laid hold of the gospel announcements of forgiveness, acceptance and needful grace, we are not the children of God, and cannot stand before him as such. Until then, we have no liberty before God, and cannot suppose that any praise or freedom with him is acceptable in his sight. It is only when we have the assurance of his favor, that our sins are forgiven us, and that his Spirit is with us to empower us to hold converse with the awful Sovereign of heaven and earth, that we can at any time justly enter upon worship in its fullest sense.

But, having confessed and deplored our sinfulness, and earnestly thrown ourselves upon God's mercy in Christ Jesus, and grasped hold of his assurance of forgiveness and grace, we appear before him as his true children, and are in an attitude to enter upon those acts of closer familiarity, which are embraced in worship proper. Hence the Introit, or those utterances, by which we go into the wor-

ship, as God's acknowledged children. We have now no longer to "draw near;" for we have already come into nearness to our heavenly Father; and it only remains for us to go forward with that, for which we have come before him.

At this point, however, it is necessary to revert to the occasion which has brought us before him. What is it that we wish? What is the subject, upon which we propose to commune with the Divine Majesty? Not all the topics and themes of Christianity can occupy us at once. Hence these topics have been classified, and referred to particular seasons of the Church Year, and to different times of our appearance before God. There is an Advent season, referring to the coming of Christ, and our preparation to receive him. There is an Epiphany season, referring to the methods, in which the Saviour manifested himself to those whom he came to save. There is a Lenten season and a Passion season, referring more especially to his sufferings for our salvation. There is an Easter season, referring to his glorious victory over death and hell, and the comforts and assurances clustering around that great event. And there are various other seasons, each having its own more specific burden and theme. We need, therefore, to bethink ourselves as to what is the particular subject, about which we would converse with God, and thank him, and seek his gracious direction and help. To assist and guide us in this is the office of the *Introit*, which is the going into the worship proper. It is carefully prescribed, that the theme of the service may be devoutly and scripturally expressed, all thoughts centred upon it, and all proceedings ordered accordingly. Is it the Advent season? The words of the *Introit* are: "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold thy salvation cometh. The Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard, and ye shall have gladness of heart. Give ear, O shepherd of Israel: Thou that leadest Joseph like a flock." Is it the Easter season? The words of the *Introit* are: "I am the Resurrection and the Life: all power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Halleluia! Lo, I am with you alway: even unto the end of the world. Halleluia! For to this end Christ both died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." And so in every other season, the *Introit*, composed of certain pregnant sentences selected from the Psalms or other Scriptures, declares the

particular theme or subject then specially in mind for that day's meditations, thanksgiving and enjoyment. It is true that the worship might proceed without this special utterance of the subject of it; but then the matter would be in uncertainty, and the people would be proposing an interview with God, without knowing exactly what they came for, and would have to render their praise and worship without anything specific in their minds for which to give glory. And as we cannot go into converse with God without mentioning something as the theme and subject of that converse, it is orderly and well that the matter should be carefully thought out in advance, and expressed at the time in proper words, which is done in these Introits, which have been in use in the Church from time immemorial. It is one of the weaknesses and defects of the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, that it has no Introits.

An invariable part of the Introit, except in Passion Week, is the united ascription of glory to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; according to a formula which has had its place in the holiest Christian worship from the earliest ages. This is known as the *Lesser Doxology*, as compared with the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which comes afterwards. Prescribed as it is, as a response to the words of the Introit, it has a three-fold reference. It is an act of praise and adoration in general, in view of the glory and majesty of God. But as the first note of praise, which occurs in the service, it refers more definitely to the unspeakable grace, in which we are thus privileged to stand before our Maker and Redeemer as his accepted children. But it also has a yet more direct reference to the blessed things, which are announced in the Introit, and to which the worship at the time is more especially adjusted.

It is prescribed, however, that the *Gloria Patri* shall not be sung in the services of Passion Week. Good Friday is the day above all days, in which the Church has chosen to occupy herself with the particular commemoration of the last bitter sufferings and death of her Lord. While these awful facts are being reviewed, she does not think it fitting to exult after her usual manner. Then the Introit is: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities. All we, like

sheep, have gone astray; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." And as men, when most moved, are often most silent; and even in the worship of heaven there is sometimes a solemn pause, more expressive than speech (Rev. 8 : 1); the Church has felt that her feelings, at the contemplation of her Lord's sufferings, are best expressed by here putting absolute silence in the place of wanted song.

But on all other occasions of a full service, it is prescribed that this Doxology shall be used. Of old it was commanded: "Give unto the Lord glory and strength; give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name," Ps. 19 : 1, 2. In John's description of the worship in heaven, Doxology plays a most conspicuous part, in which all creatures join, saying: "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever," Rev. 5 : 13. We find in the Epistles of Paul, also, a particular formula of this kind, as well as in the writings of other apostles. It was accordingly held as a mark of the true worship in the earlier Christian ages, that it always employed a formula of ascription of glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

The most ancient records of the *Gloria Patri*, as employed in Christian worship, give the simple sentence: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." In some churches it afterwards read: "Glory and honor be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." When, and by whom, the very appropriate additional phrase: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be," was inserted, we know not; but it also occurs in very ancient use. The Arians, on account of their false doctrines concerning the Trinity, labored hard to change this formula, for the reason that it was a standing condemnation of their heresies. It has accordingly ever since been the more rigidly insisted on by all orthodox Churches, as one of the tests or testimonies of a sound faith, as well as a most fitting utterance of praise. Whenever men become squeamish about Doxologies, and particularly this one, which has been hallowed by the use of all true Christians since the time of the apostles, there is reason to suspect some lurking heresy, touching the most fundamental things of our holy Christianity. The Arians

of old, the Socinians after the Reformation, and the Rationalists and Unitarians, of more recent date, could not abide it. But our Church, wherever she has been herself, has always accepted and employed it in her services, along with the early Christians.

Nor is it possible to frame a more scriptural or more expressive formula for the purpose, which this has so long and so universally served. All the ages have not been able to improve upon its sublime words. For brevity, for majesty, for comprehensiveness, and for soul-stirring beauty, there is nothing to compete with it, as an utterance of the holiest worship that a Christian heart can speak. Traced, as it has been, for the most part, to the apostles themselves, and embodying, as it does, their inspired words and heaven-tutored spirit, we would be greatly at fault not to give it place where our Church has always put it. By it our devotions begin to take wings, and to soar aloft from the dust and miseries of earth. By its devout use, we begin to join ourselves to the highest adoration and praise which sound in the Church on earth, or among the worshippers in heaven. And happy he, who, from his soul, can ever sing: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

The *Kyrie Eleison*—"Lord have mercy upon us"—is one of the most ancient and wide-spread forms of address to God known upon earth. With but little variation, it has been employed in the holiest services of God's people, since the days of David and Solomon. We find it in the Psalms, 51 and 123. We encounter it in Matt. 9 : 27 ; 15 : 22 ; 20 : 30 ; and Mark 10 : 47. It was in common use in the synagogues of the Jews, and so employed by all the apostles. It had a place in all the Greek formulas of devotion, from the earliest ages of the Christian Church. In its present form, it was in common, if not universal, use, more than a thousand years ago. Luther recommended its employment in every Sunday service. It is prescribed in all the great Lutheran Liturgies. And if there is any one ancient formula entitled to a place in a complete order of service, it is this. It is not possible to find the least objection to it, and its pre-eminent propriety is patent to all who have in them a true Christian sense.

The real nature of the *Kyrie Eleison*, is often much mistaken. A superficial view of it has led some moderns to

regard it as a confession of sin, who would, accordingly, have it connected only with the confessional part of the service. It is true, that it readily and beautifully blends with the act of confession, as it does with all prayers, no matter of what specific character; but it is not itself a confession, at least not of sin. It is the cry of conscious weakness and infirmity—a prayer for commiseration and help,—but it is not a confession of sin, any more than the beggar's petition for alms is an acknowledgment of crimes. It blends as readily and beautifully with the sublimest of mortal praises, as with penitential humiliation. We can easily conceive of it, as uttered by the saints in heaven, where there certainly is no more confession of guilt, and no more asking for remission of sins.

There are several connections, in which the Church has used it. From the earliest ages we find it joined to the *Litanies*, which place it still holds. It is itself often called the Lesser Litany. In this connection it partakes somewhat of a penitential character. But we find it as freely joined with the *Glorias*, and with the highest acts of exultant adoration. The truth is, that it affiliates with any and every act of worship rendered by man, and fits as well to the highest as to the lowest. Hence the Church has ever provided for its use in different parts, or sections of her services.

But, we do injustice to the *Kyrie*, by making it a mere adjunct of something else. It has an independent character of its own, just as the confession has a character of its own, and the Introit, the Collect, and the Creed. This is fully acknowledged and set out in all the great Liturgies, especially of the Western Church, both before and since the Reformation. And if it has an independent character of its own, it is most justly entitled to a *place* of its own, in the arrangement of the service. Allowing it nowhere to be anything but a prelude or filling out of something else, robs it of its independent character, abridges its meaning, and necessarily makes of it much less than it is.

The "Church Book" inserts it between the Introit and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, or chief Hymn of Praise. (We speak here of the First Order of Morning Service. For the Second we have very little respect, either as an organic structure, or as a Lutheran Service.) In this place we find it a thousand years before the Reformation. Luther, in 1523, directed that, after the Introit, or the Introit Psalm,

the Kyrie should be repeated three times, and followed by the singing of the Gloria in Excelsis. The Brandenburg-Nürnberg Liturgy (1533), the Saxon Liturgy (1539), and all the great Lutheran Liturgies, so far as we have ascertained, as well as the first English Book of Common Prayer (1549), follow this order. Nor is there, in Liturgies, anything more generally conceded and agreed, than that the Kyrie, whatever other uses may be made of it, is entitled to an independent place in every complete order of divine worship; or than that *the* place for it is, after the Introit, before the Gloria in Excelsis. The modern attempts to rob it of an independent place in the service, and to merge it in the confession of sin, never to be heard of again, except in the subordinate services, in which the Litany is used, certainly *should* not, and, we hope, *will* not, succeed.

Granting, then, that the Kyrie should have a place, as it has a character, of its own, it is easily to be seen that it is only properly located midway between the lowest and the highest parts of the service. In the Confession, the soul lies prostrate under the heaviest of all human burdens. This is the lowest part of the service. In the Absolution, that burden is laid off, and the promises of forgiveness are applied, to the comfort of every believer. To the peace of remission of sins, through the blood of Christ, the Introit adds the joy of the particular occasion,—of the Incarnation, if it be Christmas, or of the Resurrection, if it be Easter. The worshippers thus come very near before God, gratefully delighting themselves in the high privilege, as expressed in the Gloria Patri. But in so sacred a presence, and in thus speaking to the Almighty, the soul cannot bethink itself, without feeling the necessity of new supplies of strength and grace for the situation, or without being impelled to ask the same, in just such words as the Kyrie furnishes. What is dust and ashes that it should stand before the Eternal Jehovah, and venture to praise him to his face? How shall miserable man command his thoughts, and words, and feelings, so as to sustain himself in converse so exalted, heavenly and awful? Though released from deserved condemnation for past transgressions, look which way he will, weaknesses and necessities compass him about, for which his own strength is utterly incompetent. He still, and especially in these new and high relations and exercises, needs unspeakable measures of di-

vine commiseration and grace. A heavy pressure is upon him,—not the pressure of unpardoned sin, but the pressure of a sense of unworthiness, and weakness, and conscious inability to stand, much less to advance yet higher, a pressure which demands expression, necessitates some sort of grasping about for the required support. And if any words in human language fit to the case, these words are the *Kyrie Eleison*. In them the congregation sums up all its needs for a happy continuation of this communion with the Almighty, throws itself confidently upon the mercy and grace of the Triune God, and takes hold upon the hand of its Lord, to be led and upheld in essaying to go forward.

In this place, also, the *Kyrie* has its widest and fullest significance in relation to other parts of the worship. It recalls the stages, through which the worshipping congregation has passed. It expresses the realization of the momentous character of the situation. And it looks forward to all that is to come. It embodies the results of what has gone before, and it prepares for higher acts, that are to succeed. It is a sort of spiritual pausing place, for the gathering of fresh strength in the laborious ascent, laborious by reason of our weakness, where, by looking back over the way that he has come, and upward toward what is yet to be attained, the worshipper leans hard upon his Lord, and pleads not to be forsaken in the high but perilous endeavor. Put the *Kyrie* anywhere else, and, whatever its appropriateness or beauties may be, its significance is curtailed, its dignity is obscured, and some of its most valuable offices are swallowed up and lost.

Some have thought it an unnatural and repulsive letting down, to introduce the *Kyrie Eleison* after the high strain begun in the *Gloria Patri*. But the Church has not generally shared this feeling. Luther had no such consciousness. Nor is there a letting down, any more than the second strain in the *Gloria in Excelsis* is destructive of the exultant majesty of worship and adoration which roll through that angelic hymn. A man standing upon some exalted elevation, is just as high when he looks downwards, as when he looks upwards. The alteration in the direction of his vision does not change the altitude of his position. So in this instance. The spiritual stand-point of the worshippers is not changed, only their view is made to take in the situation more fully, and the effort is put

forth to have their hold and footing more secure. In the hearing of the Absolution, and the good tidings of the Introit, the eye of the soul is upward and Godward; and from what it thus beholds, results the bursting forth of praise in the *Gloria Patri*. But, having risen so high, the worshipper begins to glance about him, and to bethink himself where he is, and to realize the necessities and dangers of his situation, and to make sure of the grace he feels to be required, before adventuring further. And this is what occurs in the proper use of the *Kyrie* in this place. It is not a coming down, but a most devout, energetic and comprehensive application to the Triune God, to be kept from falling. It is not a sudden return to the condition of a penitential confession, but rather a spreading of the spiritual wings for still sublimer ascensions. There are some, also, who are averse to the *Kyrie* on the ground of the repetitions. They have a feeling that it comes under the Saviour's prohibition, where he says: "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do," Matt. 6 : 7. But, in forbidding "*vain repetitions*," Christ assumes that there are some repetitions, which are *not vain*. An example of heathenish vain repetitions is recorded in 1 Kings 18 : 26, where it is said that the idol priests "called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us." It had also become the custom of the Papists, with whom the rubric still holds, that the choir should repeat the *Kyrie* nine times, or continue repeating it until signaled by the priest to desist. Admonitions are also in existence, in Romish records, directing priests and people to repeat it every day one hundred times, as a meritorious work. Such uses of the *Kyrie* are, unquestionably, superstitious, heathenish and vain. But the three-fold praying of it once a week, in the main Sunday service, which Luther approved and recommended, and the manner of its use, as proposed in the "Church Book," and Lutheran Liturgies generally, certainly do not fall under this censure. Bartimeus used very urgent repetitions of a similar sort, when he applied to the Saviour to be relieved of his blindness; but so far from discouraging them, Jesus accepted and honored his petition, and miraculously granted his request. Amid the sorrowful pressure in Gethsemane, our blessed Lord himself used this kind of repetition, "*and prayed and spake the same words*" three

times in immediate succession. He also encourages us to be importunate. And in the *Kyrie Eleison*, employed in its proper place, the words being so few, the import so comprehensive, and the situation so impressive, it would be a weakness and an anomaly, not to repeat it. A prayer of *two words*, which grasps in itself all the deepest necessities of Christian life, and sweeps through time and eternity, will not only bear, but, in all reason and propriety, requires, more than a single rehearsal. The best saints that have lived used such repetitions to their profit, and we will not err by copying their example. The minister prays, "Lord have mercy upon us;" and the congregation prays, "Lord have mercy upon us." Three times the minister so prays, and three time the congregation,—*three times*, in allusion to the Trinity of that Almighty and Eternal Being, before whom all stand, and also as expressive of that completeness which connects with the number three.

After the *Kyrie*, direction is given for the singing of the first and the greatest of the Church's Morning Hymns—the *Gloria in Excelsis*. The present Book of Common Prayer puts this Hymn in the Post-communion service, where, neither by origin, character, or the general use of the ancient Church, does it belong. The Holy Sacrament of the Supper, is the crown of all acts of communion with God. Having worthily attended to that Divine Feast, we can go no higher in this world. The next step is heaven. It is not in keeping, therefore, for the worshippers directly to make another effort, and to start a new strain, by here introducing the *Gloria in Excelsis*. A subdued song of praise and thanksgiving is all that is called for, at the close of the communion. But the *Gloria in Excelsis* is not merely such a song. It has other elements, and an active and ascending spirit of adoring supplication, which do not fall in with the final sinking of the service into rest, or the quietude and subsidence of the spirit, in leaving off the celebration of its highest fellowship with God possible on earth.

If we conceive of the service as a sort of dramatic rehearsal of the work of Redemption, as the early Church largely did, it is particularly out of place to put the *Gloria in Excelsis* after the Communion. In every aspect in which it can be viewed, it connects with Christ's birth, rather than with his death—with the opening of the process, not with its close. Everything, indeed, points more

to the *Nunc Dimittis* as the proper Post-communion Hymn, and calls for the *Gloria in Excelsis* just where the "Church Book" places it, and where the original Book of Common Prayer put it, as the first great *Morning Hymn*, looking to the highest work of the day as still before it.

It is often called the Angelic Hymn, for the reason that the first part of it was first sung by the angels, on the first morning of our era. Who put it into the form in which we now have it, is unknown. Its origin dates back to oriental times. It was daily used as a morning hymn in the days of Athanasius. It is one of the very oldest, purest and most cherished of Christian canticles. It was, perhaps, one of those very hymns to which Pliny referred, when he wrote to the Roman Emperor of the Christians of his time meeting together before the dawn, to sing hymns to Christ, as God. Luther refers to it with special commendation, as excellent and glorious, and directed that it should be sung every Sunday, immediately after the *Kyrie*. "Whether it first sprang to light in a burst of choral song, like that inspired hymn in the Acts; or was bestowed upon the Church through the heavenly meditations of one solitary believer; or gradually, like a river, by its tributary streams, rose to what it is," does not matter. We know that it has come down to us from the days of the Church's primeval purity. And though it had to come through dark spiritual morasses, rank with all kinds of errors and idolatries, and often had to keep company with prayers and songs to dead men, and with Aves and Litanies, which savored not of the pure doctrine of Christ, it has reached us without taint or injury, as if carefully guarded on the way by those bright angels, who were the authors of its first grand strain.

A complete hymn, perfect in all its parts, and exactly adapted to be the vehicle of the Church's highest worship, is one of the rarest things to be found on earth. "It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof. It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx, or the sapphire."

A true hymn is true poetry—true soul, and not machine work. Every word burns with the most exalted and the most truthful feeling and thought, and the whole piece flames, from end to end, with the intensest zeal and fire of devotion, harmoniously, gracefully, justly and fully expressed.

A complete hymn is methodical in its structure, answering the demands of logic and rigid order, with all the freedom and elasticity of utterance, which knows neither constraint nor law.

A true hymn is strongly doctrinal and objective. It epitomizes in few words the substance of the gospel, just as it is to a healthful soul fully awake to it and sacredly moved by it. Mere feeling or sentiment, however well expressed, if doctrinal faith be lacking, is deficient in the highest attribute of a true hymn.

Everything, in a genuine hymn, is worship, and nothing but worship—adoration, praise, zeal for God, glorying in God, glad accord with his will and purposes, earnest seeking unto the Father, Son and Spirit, as the sublimest good, and the only joy and hope of man.*

A complete hymn is brief. The highest and holiest hymnic utterances in the Scriptures, especially those from celestial lips, are all short. The space for the hymn in a full service, is necessarily very narrow. And, if it is what it should be, the strain is too elevated and intense to be prolonged, lest the mind flag, and the feelings fall.

The range of a perfect hymn, is also heavenly and ample, and is from a stand-point so near the throne of God, that we feel no hindrance to our singing it in heaven.

The combination of all these qualities, in one or two dozen lines, is a different thing from the rhyme-making and subjective platitudes with which our books of song for the Churches are loaded and disgraced. Success in such a work, is more rare than the founding of empires. Its attainment is a greater achievement than the conquest of the world. Yet, we have a few hymns, which well answer to this description. And, among them, this *Gloria in Excelsis* is, perhaps, the oldest and the best. It is, therefore, rightfully selected to fill the first place in the Order of the Church's worship.

The "Church Book" names a second hymn, as worthy to be interchanged with the *Gloria in Excelsis*, viz: the *Te Deum Laudamus*. For special occasions, this has generally been preferred, for the reason that there is more of it. But, on that very account, it is not so happily adapted to every Sunday's use. It also is a true and sublime hymn, "rational, majestic, and worthy of the Spouse of

* See Augustine in Ps. 148.

Christ," who has been singing it, betimes, for more than a thousand years. By whom it was composed, is not known. Parts of it, doubtless, date back to very early Christian times. The story of its joint composition by Ambrose and Augustine, at the Baptism of the latter, is a myth. The germs of it were before these fathers, and some features of it may be of later date. It had its origin in some sacred song of the Orient, and most likely grew out of various early Christian hymns, fragments of which it embodies. It is found in one of the oldest manuscript gospels of the sixth century, immediately following the sacred narratives. It is called the hymn of Ambrose, as he first gave it currency among the Latins. He, perhaps, translated it into Latin for the use of his Church at Milan, adding, it may be, some things of his own. And through his influence, and that of Augustine, it afterwards became one of the chief morning hymns of the Western Churches. It was sung at the coronation of Charlemagne, about A. D. 800, and, after that, at the crowning of succeeding emperors and kings, and on great occasions generally, even to the present day. Luther highly approved it, and himself translated it into German, for the use of the evangelical churches. He calls it an admirable creed, made into song, not only for the setting forth of the right faith, but as a hymn of praise and thanksgiving to God. Comber describes it as at once a song of praise, a creed, and a supplication. "It is faith, seized with a sudden joy as she counts her treasures, and laying them at the feet of Jesus in a song; it is the incense of prayer, rising so near the rainbow round the throne, as to catch its light, and become radiant as well as fragrant,—a cloud of incense, illumined into a cloud of glory.

The present Book of Common Prayer, prescribes it as the chief Morning Hymn "daily throughout the year," though allowing an alternative between it and the Apocryphal Canticle, *Benedicite, omnia opera*. If we had not the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Te Deum* might, with propriety, hold this high place; but, as it is, the "Church Book," with the Lutheran Liturgies in general, and with the original Book of Common Prayer itself, has more justly decided the merits of the several compositions concerned, and more faithfully followed the ancient Churches in giving the *Gloria in Excelsis* the pre-eminence among the Morning Hymns. Very justly, however, it is provided,

that it may be interchanged with the *Te Deum*, when circumstances render it desirable. Other canticles or hymns are also allowed to be used in this place; but none others are acknowledged as having anything like the same claims as the *Gloria in Excelsis*, first, and the *Te Deum Laudamus*, second. In either of these sacred hymns, but especially in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Church realizes the advent and presence of her Lord. In it she hears the song of the angels over his birth, and takes it up with them, and joyfully makes it her own. Away from self, her thoughts soar to God, and rest, not in her joy in him, but on himself, who is her joy. How profound is the adoration offered! How thick the thronging praises that well up from her heart, and pour from her lips! "We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee, for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God, the Father Almighty!" How profound the adoration she offers to Jesus, only begotten Son of the Father, Lord God, and Lamb of God, sitting at the right hand of God, who only is holy, who only is most high! How passionate the pleadings, that He that taketh away the sins of the world, would have mercy upon her, and receive her prayer! And how thrilling the burst of praise which presently drowns her notes on plaintive entreaty, as she hails her King, glorified on his throne, in the heights of heaven! "For Thou only art holy; Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father!" Blessed he, who can sing this song with all his heart, and in whose heart it ever sings, from hour to hour, through all the duties, trials and adversities of life! His walk is with God, and his path is as the light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

With the *Gloria in Excelsis*, this division of the service terminates. The worshippers have spoken and fully declared themselves. They have risen as high, as they can rise, until they hear God speak. Hitherto he hath not spoken. He has been listening to the voice of his children, and receiving their adoring addresses, but has said nothing. It is now for them to be silent, and to hear what he shall say. They cease their song, and what follows gravitates toward another centre.

ARTICLE VI.

LUTHERANISM BEFORE LUTHER.

By REV. R. WEISER, Manchester, Md.

From the day that Christ organized his Church at Capernaum, by calling his disciples, that Church has existed in the world, and will continue, until the affairs of this world shall have come to a close. The Church has existed for over eighteen hundred years, under various circumstances, sometimes favorable, but more frequently unfavorable. Jesus had said, that she should always exist, and that the gates of hell should never prevail against her, and they never did, and never will.

The Romanists often ask the question, "Where was your Church before Luther?" This question we shall endeavor to answer. We shall attempt to show that the system of religious truth called *Lutheranism*, or *Protestantism*, has always existed. We do not use the word *Lutheranism*, in its restricted, or sectarian sense, but attach to it, its broad Protestant meaning. The work of Luther is very properly called a "Reformation of the Church," clearly implying that the Church existed before him, for if the Church had not existed, he could not have reformed it. Luther has sometimes, though very erroneously, been called the "Founder of the Lutheran Church." This is a great mistake; he was not the Founder, he was nothing more than a Reformer. Christ is the only Founder of the Lutheran Church. Paul says (1 Cor. 3:11): "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." "On this Rock," says Christ, (Matt. 16:18,) "I will build my Church." The Church, then, was built, or founded by Christ, not by Luther. If Luther would have been the Founder of the Church, like all human institutions she would long since have passed away. But she was founded by one, to whom all power in heaven and on earth has been given, and who is, therefore, able to protect and preserve her amid all the changes and revolutions of time. When Christ laid the foundation of his Church it was

complete; the doctrines he taught, and the great moral principles which flow from them, are neither to be altered nor amended by men. No amount of intelligence, or refinement, can ever make one of those great principles obsolete, or unnecessary. The moral and intellectual structure is complete and perfect in all its parts. There is nothing redundant, there is nothing wanting. When Jesus was expiring on the cross, he exclaimed, *It is finished*, The work of founding the redeemed Church was then completed. The types and shadows of the ceremonial law were all consummated; the foundation of the new Church was laid, which was to last to the end of time. No other foundation was ever to be laid. This foundation was deep and broad enough for the whole world, and no other was required.

The Church of Christ is always represented in the Bible as a unit. When the word *Church*, is used in Scripture in its generic sense, it is always in the singular number, thus clearly showing that the inspired writers looked upon it as a unit. This Church was founded in the year, 30 A. D. Bengel says in his Harmony of the Four Gospels, "on the 14th day of March A. D. 30." The Reformation of this Church took place at Wittenberg, on the 31st of October, 1517. What eventful scenes are laid between A. D. 30, and 1517! What a chapter could be written on these fourteen hundred and eighty-seven years! What a mixture of darkness and light! What mighty struggles, what wrongs, what disasters and triumphs, what persecution and sufferings, did not the Church endure during those eventful years!

At first, when this Church was founded, her progress was slow. The time for her rapid growth had not yet come. But after her great Founder had suffered, and bled, and died on the cross, and risen again from the dead, and had ascended up on high, then commenced the ingathering of souls. On the day of Pentecost, commenced the process of sanctification in three thousand souls, and from that time, the grace of God, through the Holy Spirit, has wrought mightily in the world. From that day to the present, countless millions of lost and ruined sinners have been awakened and converted, and prepared for the joys of heaven in this Church. The stream that then commenced flowing into the Church triumphant above, is constantly deepening and widening, and will continue to in-

crease until this whole apostate world shall have been brought to God.

Notwithstanding this glorious Church, by the permission of her great Founder, has had her centuries of gloom and deep depression, yet she has ever been the "light of the world, and the salt of the earth." She has always had her pious and holy members, those, "of whom the world was not worthy;" those, who, amid sufferings and persecutions, amid sunshine and storm, always clung around the cross of Christ; those, whose love many waters could not quench, and whose constancy the fires of the stake could not overcome. The first disciples who were called, were all believing, working and speaking witnesses for the truth. Does not this clearly indicate what Jesus intended his Church to be; a living, working, missionary Church. Unlike the old Jewish Church, which was stationary, and its members all silent worshippers, the new Church was to be aggressive, its members were all to go forth into the world to publish the gospel; they were to invade the strongholds of idolatry and error every where. As soon as the Church ceased to be aggressive, she lost her power. Hence we see, that soon after the age of the apostles, as soon as the laymen ceased to labor, her piety declined, and error arose in every form and shape. As soon as the clergy began to monopolize all the functions of religion, the divinely appointed priesthood of all Christians was ignored and set aside, and the Church became an engine of oppression and wrong; those who were only appointed to direct the energies of the masses, and to lead them in their devotions, became their oppressors, and lorded it over God's heritage. Here we see the commencement of those mighty conflicts, which raged so fearfully through so many dark centuries.

The Bible clearly teaches the universal priesthood of all believers; the Church of Rome denies it. This is the great diverging point between Romanism and Lutheranism. Hence while Rome carefully kept the Word of God from the laity, Lutheranism, conscious of the support of that Word, gave it freely to all her members. As soon as the Bishop of Rome was appointed metropolitan, or universal, Bishop of the whole Church, he set up the claim of infallibility, a mere figment, that was no where even hinted at in the Bible, and never dreamed of in the Church.

Thenceforward, the Pope, as Christ's vicegerent on earth, claimed to be the only interpreter of God's Word; all men were bound to understand the doctrines of religion as he understood them, and in no other way. Hence, out of this error grew the whole rotten fabric of Romanism. And from this sprang the spirit of persecution. Hence, too, Romanism has built the following system of error upon this pretended infallibility.

I. That Christ has established his Church on earth, and that Church is the Church of Rome.

II. That all men are obliged to hear that Church, because she is infallible.

III. That Christ appointed St. Peter the head of that Church, and that the Pope or Bishop of Rome, is the lawful and only successor of St. Peter, and, consequently, he is now the head of that Church.

IV. That there are seven Sacraments appointed in the Church, viz.: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. That in the Eucharist, there are present truly and really and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is, by the omnipotence of God, a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood of Christ.

V. That under either kind, Christ is received whole and entire.

VI. That Christ has left to his Church the power to grant indulgences.

VII. That there is a Purgatory, or middle state, and that the souls of imperfect Christians, therein detained, are helped by the prayers of the faithful.

VIII. That honor and veneration are due to the angels and to saints, that they offer prayers to God for us, that it is good and profitable to have recourse to their intercessions, and that the relics of God's particular servants are to be held in respect.

"These," says a distinguished Roman Catholic writer, "are the great points of Catholic belief, by which we are distinguished from other Christian societies, and these only are the real and essential tenets of our religion."*

This is certainly "teaching for doctrines the command-

* Haywood's Book of all Religions, p. 102.

ments of men." These doctrines were never taught by Christ, or his apostles, nor by their authority. The true Church of Christ never taught such errors; they have done immense injury to the cause of Christ, and have filled all Catholic countries with ignorance, superstition and wickedness. And just so long as such sentiments, and the abuses that they necessarily engender, prevail in any country, will the people be ignorant and vicious. This then, cannot be the Church which Christ founded. It was founded by others. To this whole system of error, Lutheranism is opposed. Lutheranism, too, believes in a succession, in the life stream of the Church, coming down, in an unbroken current, from the days of Christ. Lutheranism maintains that the Church of Christ is the same in all ages, and as such she must teach the same doctrines in all ages and all countries. The same doctrine Jesus taught at Nazareth, Capernaum and Jerusalem, and on the Mount of Beatitudes; Peter at Jerusalem and Philippi; John at Smyrna, and Paul at Rome and Athens; Polycarp at Smyrna, Ignatius at Antioch, Justin Martyr at Ephesus, Irenæus at Lyons, Tertullian at Carthage, Origen at Alexandria, Augustine at Hippo, Wicliffe at Oxford, Huss at Prague, Luther at Wittenberg. He had no new gospel to preach, he preached nothing but the old gospel, that had been preached for ages. He found the Church, not in Rome, but in the Bible, in that old Latin copy of the Vulgate that was chained at Erfurt. He liberated that blessed old volume, and declared to the world that the, "Word of God was not bound." The harmony between Lutheranism and the Word of God, proves its identity with God's people who lived before Luther. It would not be a difficult task to show from the writings of the pious and orthodox Church fathers, that Luther taught no new doctrines. He frequently appeals to the fathers for confirmation of his views.

Dr. Augustus Pfeiffer, of Leipsic,* in 1683, published a

*In order to show with what intellectual force the preachers of our Church contended with Romanism towards the close of the seventeenth century, a list is presented of the books, in all fifty-two, published in 1682 by Dr. A. Pfeiffer. He calls his Catalogue, *Pynoplia Anti Papistica*. Friederich Hortleders Liber von den Uhrsachen Des Teuchen Kriegs. 1629. Fried. Balduini de vera Christi Ecclesia ante Tempora Lutheri. Wittenberg, 1610. John Jac Beck Lutherthum

spirited little polemic, which he calls "*Lutherthum vor Luther*," in which he shows clearly, that Luther taught nothing but the good old gospel of Christ. A Romish priest, it appears, by the name of P. Arnold Angel, had written and published a book against Lutheranism. This book was a Polemic Poem, and Dr. Pfeiffer answers it in German and Latin prose. If Angel's poetry is a fair specimen of German poetry two hundred years ago, it must

vor dem Luther. Nurenberg, 1643. Theod. Berenici Berneggeri Proaulium Tubae pacis Contra Classicum Scioppii. Dr. Joh. Bottsacci Demonstratis quod Ecclesia Romana non sit sancta. Wittenberg, 1629. Dr. Casper Erasmi Brochmandi Lucerna Sermonis Prophetici opposita veritas Pontif.—Ejusdem Apologia. 1653. Ejusdem Libri V. de Anti Christi. 1628. Dr. Abram Calovii Matæologia Papisticae. Wittenberg, 1656. Ejusdem Refutatio mendacissimæ relationis de literis Joh. Fried Elec. 4. Wittenberg, 1683. Sam'l Ben. Carpzovii Examin novæ praezos F. Massenii. Wittenberg, 1677. Daniel Chemieri Panstratia Catholica. Fol. 1629. Dr. Martin Chemnitii Examen Concilii Tridentini. Fol. 1585. Concilia Theologica, Wittenbergensis. Fol. 1666. Dr. Joh. Conrad Dannhaweri Hodomoria spiritus Papaei. 1654. Ejusdem Anti Christosophia. 1640. Ejusdem Liber Conscientia apertus. 1667. Dantziger Catechismi Defensio wider P. Caroln, oder grundliche Ausführung und Behauptung der Fundamental Articul Evangelischer Lehre. This must be a valuable work. Dantzig, 1651. Dr. Christiani Dreieri Disputatio Anti Papistica. 1661. Math. Flaccii Illyrici Liber de Contradictionis et dissentionibus Pontif. Basil, 1565. I presume re-published in 1656. Dr. Helv. Garthii Acta et Postacta Colloquii. Pragensis, 1610. Dr. Joh. Gerhardi Loci Theologici. 1657. Ejusdem Confessio Cathol. 1634. Ejusdem Grundliche Antwort auf den Papstlichen Morgenstern. 1628. M. J. Conr. Gœbelii Augs. Confession und Jubel Predigten. 1633. Dr. Christiani Grossi De Ministerii Evangelici veritate Pontificis Romanii. 1645. Peter Haberkorn, D. D. Translatio De ministerii Evangelici efficacia. 1457. This is an old work published before the Reformation and, perhaps, republished by Dr. Grossius with additions. M. Geo. Hartmani Grundliche Widerlegung des Labyrinths Lutherischer Reformation P. Brunonis. 1662. Haupt Vertheidigung des Evangelischen Aupfels. 1630. This is a work we should like to see in order to find out what was considered the Evangelical apple of the eye. Dr. Jac. Heilbrunner's Uncatholisch Pabstthum. 1614. Dr. Joh. Hulsemanni Manuale Conf. Augustanæ Contra Balth. Hagerum. 1673. Ejusdem de Ministerio ordinationis. 1657. Dr. Egid Hunnii Art. de

have been very rough and imperfect. It reads very much like Rouse's version of the Psalms, and has about as much poetic unction. As a specimen, we furnish a few extracts from P. A. Angel's Polemic Poem.

“Ihr Predicanten schreyet all,
Das Pabsthum sey der gross Abfall
Von Christi Kirch und seinem Wort,
Ich frag: Wie, wann, an welchem Ort
Ist dieser Abfall erst geschahn,
Wer hat ihn mehr vor euch gesehn:
Wir zehlen von St. Petro her
Zwey hundert dreissig Päbst und mehr
Dern drey und dreissig all nach ein
Ums Glaubens Willen gemartert seyn;
Nennt uns aus diesen Pabsten allen
Den ersten der ist abgefallen.”

Then, again, Mr. Angel says:

“Ihr Prädicanten rufft und schreyt
Eur Selen bringt nur zur Seligkeit.

Ecclesia vera et Romana. 1604. Dr. Nic Hunnii *Apostasia Ecclesiæ Romanæ.* 1632. Ejusdem *Ecclesia Romana non Christiana.* 1630. Ejusdem *Papatus seipsum destinens.* 1631. Ejusdem *Offenbarlicher Beweiss vom Beruff Lutheri.* 1628. Dr. Andr. Kesleri *Lutherthum und Pabstthum.* 1630. Laure. Lælii *Ehrenrettung Lutheri.* 1614: Dr. Martin Lutheri *Jenische Tomi.* 1560. Then we have Dr. Balth. Meisneri *Consuetatio Catholica de fide Lutherana Capessenda et Romana Papistica deserenda contra Lessium.* 1623. Dr. John Muller *Lutherus Defensus.* 1648. Ejusdem *Vermahnung wider Dominic Jansenium.* 1630. Dr. Geo. Mylti *Explicatio Augs. Conf.* 1604. Melch. Nicolai, D. D. *Nihil ad Rem Contra Keddium.* Dr. John Pappi *Contradictiones doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ.* 1597. Dr. Andr. Osiandri *Papa non Papa—Pope no Pope.* 1616. Erasmi Sarcerii *De Consensu Ecclesiæ veræ et Patrum.* Christoph Schreiberli *De Antiqua Catholica fide utrum reperiatur apud Pontificios; an Lutheranos.* 1627. Dr. Joh. Adam Scherzi *Anti Bellarminus.* 1681. Ejusdem *Disp. de Catholico.* 1681. Dr. Theod. Thumonii. *Papa Antichristus.* 1666. Dr. Augustus Pfeifferi *Lutherthum vor Luthern.* 1683. This is the last of the series, and embodies much of the pith contained in the others. This catalogue shows us that the Lutherans of the seventeenth century fought the Man of Sin boldly and bravely.

Seyn denn in sechshundert Jahrn

All Christen Leut zur Hülln gefahren."*

These are the arguments of Rome now, as they were two hundred years ago. But Dr. Pfeiffer meets them with great force, and shows clearly when and where the fall of Rome occurred. The old worn-out argument, that all our forefathers, who died before the Reformation, were lost,⁴ is no part of our Lutheranism. We teach just the contrary. We are just now trying to prove that Lutheranism existed long before Luther, and we believe that thousands and millions were saved before the Reformation. We can adopt the language of Paul at Athens: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men to repent." We cannot resist the desire to present Dr. Pfeiffer's arguments in reply to the question of P. A. Angel. After stating that thousands of infants died before the Reformation, whose faith was not corrupted by the errors of Romanism, and, of course, were saved; and that there always were those in the Church who were the true followers of Christ, and who sealed their faith with their blood—as can be seen from "*Flavii Catalogo Testium veritatis*," and "*Historia Martyrum*," also in "*Gerhardi Confessione Catholica*," etc.—he proceeds: "I would not at all be surprised to know that the Jews proposed this same

* For the benefit of those who cannot read German, we give a correct translation of the thoughts contained in these doggerels:

"Ye preachers, one and all, do bawl
That Pop'ry from the faith did fall,
Fell from the Church, and from the word,
Pray! when, and where, has this occurred?
This fall, has it occurred to-day—
Did others see it—tell I pray?
From the first Pope to our own time,
We count two hundred in one line.
And thirty-three we name with pride,
Who, for the faith, all martyrs died!
Now name but one of these Popes all
Who from the faith did ever fall!"

The other four lines are not so easily translated, but this is the idea:

"Your preachers lustily proclaim
That salvation through their doctrines came,
That all who died before your time
Have gone to hell to weep and pine."

question to Christ and his apostles, viz.: What became of those who died before Christ came? Dr. Pfeiffer meets doggerel with doggerel, thus:

“Thr samt eurn Jüngern rufft und schreyt
Eur Selen bringt nur zur Seligkeit,
Seyn den in etlich hundert Jahren
All Juden Lent zur Höll gefahren ?”*

Dr. Pfeiffer shows the absurdity of the objections of the Romanists on the ground that those who died before the Reformation must have been lost. It appears that P. A. Angel replied to Dr. Pfeiffer's "*Lutherthum vor Luther*," in a work called "*Nihil ad Rem*," in which he attempts to show that there is nothing in the arguments of Dr. Pfeiffer. To this Dr. Pfeiffer replies, as follows. "I have clearly demonstrated in my *Lutheranism before Luther*: 1. That the Pope can err, and has frequently erred in doctrine; 2. That the Pope has committed sacrilege, because he has, in a heretical manner, altered the institution of the Lord's Supper; 3. That the doctrine of Transubstantiation is false and detestable; 4. That the Pope is Antichrist. He, who has all the marks of Antichrist, as laid down in the Scriptures, must be Antichrist; 5. That the Papists should not be called evangelical Catholics; but that we, (Lutherans) should be called Evangelical Catholic Christians. This will appear from "*Chemnitio Exam. Concil. Trident*, *Heilburnern Uncatholischem Pabstthum* and *Dr. Mullern in der vermahnung an die Gemeinde zu Hamburg wider Jansenium*. 6. That the unbroken succession claimed by Rome, is false and incapable of proof. They cannot show who was the first, second or third Pope, and sometimes they cannot show who was the real Pope afterwards. No chain can be unbroken with a single link omitted; 7. That the Popes, and the Papists, have frequently falsified the writings of the fathers, and the proceedings of the Councils; 8. That the Lutherans, above all others, have placed themselves squarely upon the Holy Scriptures. Others receive the Scriptures, either according to the meaning the Pope puts upon them, (as, for instance, the

*"Thou, with thy followers, dost proclaim
Salvation through your preaching came,
Did all the Jews before your time
Go down to hell to weep and pine?"

Papists,) or according to their own opinions, (as the Calvinists and Socinians,) or according to supposed revelation, (as the Weigelians or the fanatical Anabaptists); 9. That the Council of Trent is not supported by any respectable Church fathers, when it opposes any of our Lutheran doctrines; The withholding the cup from the laity, cannot be sustained by a single Church father. This error was first ordained by the Council of Constance, scarcely a hundred years before Luther's time; 10. That the true Church can exist in an invisible state, and in former times did so exist. By invisible we mean without any outward organization; 11. That the Lutheran Faith is much older than the Roman Catholic. Our Lutheran faith is the same as was taught by Christ and his apostles, as also by the oldest fathers of the Church. Popery was forced upon the Church long after the most respectable Church fathers lived; 12. That Luther was regularly and lawfully called to preach the gospel, and reform the Church. He had his authority from the Word of God; 13. That every Lutheran preacher is, in like manner, regularly and lawfully called to preach the gospel; 14. That the Papists themselves must admit the truth of the great Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ; 15. That the true Church of Christ is not to be found among the Papists, but among the Lutherans. For where the Holy Scriptures are properly taught, and the Holy Sacraments properly administered, there you are to look for the true Church of Christ; 16. That no one in the Papal Church can be fully convinced that he has ever been baptized.* There are many sharp points in this Doctor's defence of Lutheranism, but we lay him by for the present, and proceed. It appears, then, from this old author, that the true Church of Christ is the same in all ages. What Paul said to the Ephesians, (2 : 20) he says to us: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles, and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." "Other foundation can no man lay." We believe in succession, an unbroken succession; but not in such a one as Rome, or Oxford, claims. The succession for which Rome and Oxford contend, is a mere theological figment, a dreamy non-entity. But ours is a real, biblical, scriptural succession. All truly pious Christians are in this life stream, no mat-

* *Vide* Concil. Florent. apud Caranzam, Sess. 7, Can. 11.

ter by what name they may be called. We have no sympathy with that Lutheranism, which would exclude Christians of other denominations from the true Church of Christ. Luther says: Where the pure Word of God is preached, and the Holy Sacraments are properly administered, there is the true Church." The true Church of Christ has always existed, and does now, under a two-fold form, viz: visible and invisible, a kind of "*imperium in imperio*," or a Church within a Church. This clear and intelligent distinction is not admitted by the Church of Rome, and was not clearly apprehended even by the Reformers. Before the Reformation, all baptized persons were considered members of the Church. Lutheranism denies that the Church of Rome is the true Church of Christ. And if asked, Where then was the Church before Luther? Her reply is: The true Church was always in the world in an invisible form, the true spiritual people of God, those who had experienced the grace of God in their hearts, both in, and out of, the Church of Rome, constituted the true Church of Christ on earth. Luther belonged to the outward visible Church, by virtue of his baptism and confirmation, like all his cotemporaries; he also belonged to the spiritual, invisible Church by conversion. At Erfurt he became awakened by the operation of the Holy Spirit upon his heart, and, after a severe soul-conflict, he was converted. As soon as Luther was truly converted, he commenced preaching the gospel. In the little old wooden church in the public square at Wittenberg, a dilapidated building, Luther commenced to republish the gospel, the same gospel that Jesus had first proclaimed to the fishermen at Capernaum fourteen hundred and eighty-seven years before. From this small Church, sprang all the Protestant Churches in the world. The Church, that had hitherto been scattered through the world, now assumed form, shape, and visibility. And, whereas she had been too weak and feeble to stand up even in her own defence, she now became strong and maintained her rights. Rome, as usual, anticipated an easy conquest, but was sadly disappointed. The Church, the true Church of Christ, now sustained her ground, and, in the great religious war of thirty years, came out victor. Lutheranism achieved the liberty of the Church. She extorted from the Romish Church liberty of conscience; for this the whole Protest-

ant world is greatly indebted to Lutheranism. Lutheranism is built upon the Word of God. If there is any one fact more clearly established than another in the life of Luther, it is, that the great Reformer planted himself squarely on the Word of God. In his Preface to the Ninety-five Theses, he says: "I shall hold and teach no doctrine that is not clearly taught in God's most holy Word." This was the key note of the Reformation. When at the Diet of Worms, Luther was commanded to retract his errors, he replied: "Unless I am convinced from the Word of God, that I am in error, I cannot retract." It was on this occasion that Luther used that expression that has acquired such a world-wide fame: "*Hier stehe Ich, Ich kann nicht anders, Gott helfe mir.*" Here we see that one of the great principles of the Reformation, was an unshaken faith in the infallibility of God's Word, over against the pretended infallibility of the Romish communion. Luther found the religion he preached in the Bible. The old Papal Church, the Pope, the Councils, and what was called the unanimous consent of the Fathers, the traditions, the decretals and the ponderous volumes of schoolmen, were all nothing in his judgment, when compared to the Word of God. Those who now hang their faith on Creeds and Confessions, rather than on God's Word, are not true Lutherans. They have returned to the errors, from which Luther had liberated the Church.

Private judgment, in opposition to the authority of others, no matter what that authority was called, a Church, a Council, a Conclave, a Synod, a Diet, or a State, was one of the cardinal features of the Reformation. This right of private judgment grew directly out of another leading idea that was first agitated in the time of the Reformation, *i. e.*, man's accountability to God only for his faith. Before Luther's time, this great Protestant principle was nowhere recognized on earth. This was true of Pagan, Christian and Mohammedan countries. The State and the Church legislated about what men were to believe, and if they believed differently from the standards set up, they were punished. From this gross error and bondage, Luther liberated the Church. For this alone his name should be held in everlasting remembrance. Before the day of Luther the sacred rights of conscience were nowhere respected.

Another great principle, clearly brought out in the Re-

formation, was the necessity of individual and personal faith in Christ, as a pre-requisite to salvation. This doctrine was distinctly taught in the New Testament, but was perverted and covered over by the errors and traditions of Romanism. Hence Luther says in his Postill: "He who receives Christ as his Saviour, has not only peace of mind, but also purity of heart." "Faith destroys the old Adam, and makes us new creatures." True Lutheranism is the religion of the Bible. Luther himself was a man of deep, earnest, religious experience. How, then, could he, who had passed through such deep soul-struggles into the clear light of the gospel, go back to the ritualism of Rome? In the system of Romanism, and its affiliations, Puseyism and German Symbolism, the individual Christian, and his personal experience are lost in the concrete mass of what is called the Church. Religion has an objective force; individual experience is nothing more, in the opinion of Ritualism, than a low subjectivity. Did Luther ever preach such error? Could this man of deep religious experience, with his clear and comprehensive views of Bible truth, ever have had any sympathy with that Popish figment which makes the body of Christ in the Sacrament the sum and substance of all religion? Could he have had any sympathy with that unscriptural system which teaches that man has nothing to do with religion but to be passive in the hands of the priest, to be baptized and confirmed, and occasionally go to confession and communion, and live in sin, and yet, when death comes, to be wafted to heaven on the wings of a sublime liturgy. Luther knew nothing of such a system; he saw enough of it in Rome. Luther rejected that Papal and ritualistic tissue of error, called "sacramental grace." In his Postill* he says: "They, (the Popes and Cardinals,) themselves, as well as the Church fathers, are only men and may err. Who can depend upon what they say? They say that the Sacraments possess such power that they can confer grace even on those who do not believe; by such teaching, the grace of Christ is most effectually destroyed." Luther accepted the principles laid down in the Bible. He loved the truth as it is in Jesus, and preached it with all his might. He believed that the stream of salvation had flowed on, in one unbroken current, from the days of Christ, and would con-

* Page 318.

tinue to flow on, until it would roll its healing waters around the whole earth. The history of the Church may very properly be compared to a river, (Ps. 46:4): "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God." The river has, perhaps, its source in some far off mountain, where it bubbles up in the form of a small spring from under a moss-covered rock; then in gentle murmurs leaps down the mountain side; then tranquilly meanders through the flowery meadow; then, joined by other streams, it forms the mighty river, rolling in grandeur and majesty to its ocean home. But the river, in its long and devious course, may sometimes pass through a porous, or cavernous soil, and sink into the earth away from mortal eyes. But it still flows on, though unseen by mortal eyes. Like the lost river, the Church still flows on. Thus the Church in the dark ages seemed to human appearance to be lost, but she was only rolling on, underground. Sometimes this river would rise to the surface, but, finding an uncongenial element, would sink again, and flow on, in its subterranean channels. Thus it rose in England in the thirteenth century, when Wickliffe stood upon its banks and cried out: "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters and drink." In the fifteenth century it rose again in Bohemia, when Huss and Jerome cried: "If any man thirst let him come to Christ and drink." But it sank again. The time had not yet come. In the sixteenth century it rose again to sink no more, while the world stands. It commenced flowing at Wittenberg, and is still flowing, and will continue to flow on and on, until it shall environ the globe, and all the inhabitants of the earth shall stand upon its verdant banks, and drink from its healing waters. Thank God! we, too, and our children are permitted to stand upon the banks of this "*Beautiful river*," that flows from the throne of God.

We think we have made out our case, "Lutheranism before Luther." We use the term Lutheranism as a synonym for evangelical piety.

ARTICLE VII.

THE KEYS.

By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, O.

No passage of Scripture has, probably, been the subject of such animated discussion and varied interpretation as that contained in Matt. 16 : 18, 19 : *"I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."* The Apostolic and Christian Fathers, Bishops and Popes, commentators and critics, in connection with a host of historical (ecclesiastical) and theological writers, have given us explanations, in hints, assertions, expositions, paraphrases, interpretations, &c., derived either from a desire to give the true sense or from party interest. The location of the disputant had often much to do with deciding its meaning. It is a sad commentary on human frailty, that Rome, Constantinople, Paris, Oxford and Geneva, regarded this promise to Peter, not so much in the light of what it really designated, as an arsenal from which the sharpest weapons could be drawn with which to attack and defeat an enemy. This is seen both in the use made of the passage and in the unwarranted interpretations (even against the direct grammatical sense,)* made by

* Candor, however, requires me to add, that Protestants are, in connection with some of the fathers, chargeable with this fault. Whilst the Roman Catholics violate the sense by refusing to accept the analogy of Scripture, &c., they generally admit the natural, grammatical meaning: on the other hand, many Protestants, even at this day, in their eagerness to remove every remnant of argument in favor of the former, deliberately deny the plain grammatical sense. Especially is this done by men who are brought into direct conflict with the Papacy. It appears to me that such argumentation does

Catholics and Protestants, under the fear lest their cause should suffer by making the slightest concession.

Before the days of Pope Gelasius, A. D. 492, the fathers were by no means unanimous respecting its meaning. Whatever interpretation they individually gave, it is noticeable that they all united, agreeably to the analogy of faith, in explaining it in such a manner as avoided giving the "primacy" to Peter and the "supremacy" to the Roman See in the sense afterwards so vigorously claimed by the Romish doctors and Popes. For, they held either that the "rock," on which the Church was to be built, was Peter personally, with the expressed idea that his priority, or pre-eminence consisted in his first making known the way of salvation to Jews and Gentiles; or, they taught that by this "rock" we are to understand Peter's faith previously made in the confession that Christ was the Son of God, and that the Church is to be grounded upon this profession of faith, so wonderfully revealed to Peter (verse 17) by the heavenly Father; or, they maintained that Christ being elsewhere designated (Isa. 28 : 16; 1 Pet. 2 : 8) a rock, the expression must be directly applied to Christ himself.* Whilst they thus differed among themselves respecting the manner in which we are to apply the rock, and how we are to comprehend the phrase "the gates of hell," "the keys," "the binding and loosing," yet with entire unanimity they agreed, that in whatever sense Peter might be a foundation to the Church, the other apostles, being also thus designated (Eph. 2 : 20; Rev. 21 : 14), were participants in this honor; and, further, that whatever power was conferred by the keys, it was also granted to the remaining apostles. The quite early fathers say but little concerning it, because the parity of the ministry being acknowledged, and no contests for the primacy arising, they evidently did not deem it necessary to explain in detail

far more injury than good, being invariably hailed by every papistical scholar (yea, every tyro in language) as the best evidence of weakness. We, unnecessarily, suffer from it.

* See Barrow's Works, Vol. III. on the Pope's Supremacy, pp. 101—106, where a number of the fathers are quoted. Also Luther and Eck's discussion on the Primacy, and Bower's His. Popes, Vol. 1, p. 289. Some of the fathers did not confine themselves to one view but used one or the other as best suited their purpose at the time of writing.

what every one believed it to denote, viz.: that Peter was selected, as a chosen instrument, to establish the Church, and that the rest of the apostles, allowing him the priority, shared with him the honor and power. The successors of the apostolic fathers were driven by the contests arising in the Church, especially by the claims put forth by the Churches of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to investigate and expound the passage at greater length. In all their writings, whether foreseeing the fearful abuse to which it would be subjected, or desirous to protect themselves against the encroachments of a power already developing itself, they unite, however various their interpretations, in protesting that it bestows no power but what was possessed in common by all the apostles. These utterances of theirs, has been a source of difficulty and annoyance to the popish divines, and a generous fountain whence their antagonists, especially the Reformers, have drawn many strengthening draughts.

The protest against the silent, but advancing, infringements of ministerial rights by the lordly bishops,—this entrenchment thrown up against the advances of the aspiring patriarchs, metropolitans, primates, &c., was rudely overthrown by Pope Gelasius II. History, with its merciless pen, records not only how this was done, but assigns the reasons for its accomplishment. He issued a decree (confirmed by a council of seventy bishops) that the primacy of the Roman See depended not upon the Councils, or any decrees drawn up by them, but solely upon the words of the Saviour, "*Thou art Peter*,"* &c. Let the reader pause and reflect on this singular document. Why was it considered important or necessary by Gelasius and his pliable bishops to publish such a remarkable, unprecedented claim, based on a new, novel exposition of this passage? If we cast our eyes over the then existing condition of the Roman Empire, and keep in view the ambition of, and the struggles between, the bishops of the four chief cities to obtain the superiority, we learn why it was done. At this time, the result of the previous invasion of Alaric, Attila, Genseric, &c., Rome was under the dominion of Gothic kings, and the Western part of the Roman Empire was controlled and plundered by various bodies of barbarians.† The head of the imperial gov-

* Bower's His. Popes, Vol. I, p. 289.

† Gibbon's Dec. and Fall Rom. Emp., Vol. IV, ch. 39.

ernment was located in Constantinople, and the city, in view of its containing the Augustus, was rapidly advancing in power, rank and honor. Something in this emergency, must be speedily attempted lest the Archbishop, Exarch, or Patriarch of Constantinople, seeing the fallen condition of Rome and the exaltation of his own city, presume to the primacy, in which he might be fortified by the opinion that Constantinople was the only imperial city. This danger was not imaginary, for, as Gelasius sagaciously anticipated, this very pretension was afterwards brought forward and pressed by the Constantinopolitan Primates. It must be borne in mind, that a kind of primacy had been previously bestowed upon the Bishop of Rome by the consent of Bishops, of Emperors and even of Councils, but this was granted on account of Rome being the imperial city, the metropolis and seat of the empire. This primacy consisted in a pre-eminence of station, honor and privilege, because it was supposed that the Bishop of such a city should possess a special regard, out of respect to the place in which he was stationed. The foundation of this primacy had thus been fixed, not in the Scriptures, but in the dignity of the city occupied by the Pope. Gelasius and his advisers clearly saw, that as this dignity was withdrawn by the subjugation of Rome under the Gothic sceptre and the removal of imperial honors to Constantinople, to the same extent was his claim to the primacy damaged. Two General Councils, of Constantinople and of Chalcedon, had determined the precedence of Rome, affirming in direct terms that it was granted only "because that city was the seat of the Empire," and also had declared New Rome or Constantinople to occupy the second place because it also was honored as a seat of the Empire. The Pope had abundant reason to fear, that in the straitened and dishonored condition of Rome, his rivals, especially the one to whom had been assigned the second place of rank, would call for another General Council for the purpose of revoking the previously rendered decrees. He was aware that the Emperor Constantine had formed the plan of the ecclesiastical polity on the plan of the civil, and that the rank of the Sees was regulated according to that of the cities, whence it happened that the large body of bishops, represented in those Councils, had concluded, agreeably to the principles already introduced by the Emperors and consent (perhaps advice) of bishops, that Con-

stantinople should outrank both Antioch and Alexandria. Hence considering the abject condition of Rome, contrasted with the emoluments and power of her rivals, either a Council or Emperor might, in strict accordance with the opinions which led to the formation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, proclaim a decree or edict, giving the coveted primacy to the occupant of a more favored city. This was the danger, and the question naturally arose in an ambitious mind, how can this be avoided or eluded. Gelasius was equal to the crisis and adopted a plan which, in his estimation, and that of a host of future admirers,* made his rank independent both of Councils and Emperors. He made his appeal to the passage of Scripture cited, and he carefully incorporated it into a decree, afterwards confirmed by a Council, boldly and vauntingly saying, "that it was not to any Councils, or the decrees of any, that the holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church owed her primacy, but to the words of our Saviour, saying in the gospel, "Thou art Peter," &c., and thereby building the Church upon him, as upon a rock that nothing could shake; that the Roman Church, not having spot or wrinkle, was consecrated and exalted above all other Churches," &c., &c.†

* This Pope has been elevated to a position in the calendar of saints, and is worshipped as a saint. No reason can be given for such an honor, unless it be his continued and obstinate defence of his primacy, as well as the important discovery made by him in expounding the passage alluded to above. He certainly was not canonized for holding, what the Roman Church was afterwards pleased to call, heresy. When opposing a sect of the Manichees, who were alleged to say that "wine was the gall of the prince of darkness," and, therefore, only received the bread in the Eucharist, he bravely condemned them, and ordered that those who did not receive the Eucharist in both kinds, should be "excluded from both, because one and the same mystery cannot be divided without great sacrilege." (Bower's *His. of Popes*, Vol. I, p. 286.) He may have been sainted for making, in the same decree affirming the primacy, the Apocryphal books canonical, which, although rejected by some of his successors, nevertheless gained favor, until they were finally and irrevocably placed in the Canon by the Council of Trent.

† It is amusing to observe that the chief rival being, owing to its imperial honors, Constantinople, the Pope, in this decree, carefully

This appeal to Matt. 16 : 18, 19, introduced a new and successful defence of the Roman primacy. Although opposed by the authority of the fathers, softened by some of his successors, combated by the rival Sees, and rebutted by some candid minds, yet, through the machinations of priest-craft and monkery, the authority of imperial edicts, (especially those of Justinian, Phocas, Pepin and Charlemagne) Councils and papal bulls, the primacy and supremacy derived from it was extended in the person of the Pope of Rome, as the successor of Peter, not only to all spiritual, but, eventually, to all temporal power. It is amazing to contemplate how artfully and arrogantly this passage was quoted to defend the audacious abuse of power, until the climax was reached in the use made of it by Gregory VII, the celebrated Hildebrand. In bulls of excommunication thundered out against kings, in letters, treaties, replies to embassies, &c., &c., this passage stands forth pre-eminently as a reason for his bold assumptions of authority over all the ecclesiastical and secular powers. If we desire to see the results of such an interpretation, we shall find them compressed in the famous "*Dictatus Papæ*," containing the maxims of Hildebrand.*

ignores its precedence and actually produces a line of argument to show that it is not entitled to any. His argument, so lucid and powerful, is as follows: "The Roman Church is the first Church, because founded by the first apostle; the Church of Alexandria, the second, because founded by his disciple, St. Mark, in his name; and that of Antioch, the third, because St. Peter dwelt there before he came to Rome, and in that city the faithful were first distinguished with the name of Christians." Constantinople, too recent in origin to claim an apostolic source, afterwards made up this sad deficiency by an abundance of holy bones and relics.

* See Mosheim (Murdoch's) Eccl. His., Vol. II, p. 161, foot note, and Bower's His. Popes, Vol. II, p. 401. The rights of kings, councils, bishops, laymen, &c., were subverted and transferred over to the will of the haughty Pontiff, under the plea that the supremacy accorded to Peter and his pretended successors, embraced all power, or supreme legislation, over all persons and things. To give but a brief exhibition of the spirit and intent of such an abuse of this Scripture, I refer the reader to the following morsel of hermeneutics, given by Hildebrand in reply to the bishops who adhered to King Henry, and maintained that the power of excommunication and deposing, vested in the Pope, did not reach the persons of kings. Writing to Herman-

So long as the Popes confined their interpretations of the primacy and supremacy to spiritual or ecclesiastical affairs, however much they extended, by intrigue, gifts, &c., their temporal power, the few persons who dared to deny their expositions of Scripture, were either overwhelmed by the current of public opinion, or silenced by the terrors of ecclesiastical censure and civil interference, or convicted and executed as heretics. But just so soon as they extended the meaning of Christ's words to Peter to embrace a supremacy over sovereign princes, then a storm of invective and abuse, of crimination and recrimination, arose, such as resulted in the excommunication and deposition of emperors, kings and princes, the overthrow, excommunication and deposition of popes. The pontiffs, appreciating the vantage ground thus acquired to satisfy the utmost aspirations of human pride and ambition, with the utmost obstinacy insisted on the soundness of their scriptural exposition, fortified it with decretals, the explanations of wonder-working saints, the interests of religious societies, interdicts, &c., &c., and, when all these failed, they even, whilst in exile from Rome, or opposed by competitors, raised up to curb this pretension, poured forth their anathemas upon all, without respect of persons, who dared to limit their authority. The emperors and kings, on the other hand, dreading the rapaciousness of the shepherd who devoured the sheep irrespective of their condition,

Bishop of Metz, the mouth-piece of the party, he says: "As our Saviour did not except kings, when he granted to St. Peter and, in him, to his successors, the power of binding and loosening, why may not kings be bound and loosened, be excommunicated and absolved by him and his successors, as well as the meanest of their subjects?" Many such declarations, even more expressive and detailed, are given in his life, as written by Romanists and Protestants. I may be allowed to add, that whatever additional reasons may have been given by Gregory and his successors, to prop up the power of deposing, &c., they all were regarded inferential in comparison with the passage in question. The appeals to the phrase, "Feed my sheep," and that kings, as well as all others, were embraced in the term "sheep;" to the convenient notion that, "the episcopal dignity is of divine authority, whilst the royal dignity is the invention of men, and owes its origin to pride and ambition,"—these were after thoughts, and depend for their vitality and force on the concession that Gelasius and his successors have correctly interpreted Matt. 16 : 18, 19.

were obliged, in self defence, to seek out an interpretation of the Scripture that would exempt them from the Pope's jurisdiction in temporal things, or, at least, prevent their deposition and the summary withdrawal of their subjects' allegiance. To enable them to meet the Pope on his own chosen ground, they ordered ministers of state, bishops, Universities, lawyers, theologians, scholars, and councils, to investigate the correctness of the Popes' deductions from Matt. 16 : 18, 19. The Scriptures were studiously compared, the Fathers were read, the acts and decrees of Councils were consulted, the libraries were ransacked, and after a comparison and interchange of views, it was found that the passage, adduced to support the Pope's prerogatives, did not bestow the rights claimed. Whilst some of the sovereigns were willing, for the sake of peace and security, to concede the supremacy of the Pope in ecclesiastical and spiritual matters, provided the Pope, on his part, would concede to them a supremacy in temporal affairs, in their respective kingdoms; others, demanding a retraction of his pretended secular privileges also, were in favor of circumscribing the pontiff's ecclesiastical power within their kingdoms; whilst a third party, enlightened by the knowledge, gained in this contest, boldly called into question both the primacy and the supremacy of the Popes. All were agreed that the Roman See had acquired a dangerous, unexampled, indefensible and unjust power, and that it ought, at least, be restrained, by making the Pope amenable to a general council. Thus the combat went on, leading to bloody wars, horrible murders and fearful persecutions. The one party, the Papal, confidently affirming that the gospel, in connection with comments manufactured to order, or with proof afforded by the shortsightedness and rashness of men, sustained the holy Father in all his assumptions, and, when closely pressed, invariably referred to Matt. 16 : 18, 19 as their impregnable position. The other party, whilst relying, in part, on the decrees of the more ancient councils, on the exposure of some forged documents,* and on the fact that the early Popes ac-

* Especially the pretended decretals of Isidorus, purposely forged to prove the plenitude of the Pope's power over all bishops, &c. An imposture employed for centuries, from Nicholas I. against bishops and princes. The critics have so ruthlessly exposed the barbarous Latin of more recent origin attributed to the ancient bishops, the

knowledge of the supremacy of the Roman Emperor, mainly laid stress on the passage so volubly quoted by the Popes and their adherents, and by triumphantly producing a host of fathers who interpreted it in a manner antagonistic to the pretensions of Popery, they argued that it either had not the meaning given to it by the Bishop of Rome, or, if it had, even in part, that import, it was still too ambiguous, as the differences among the fathers proved, to allow any one but the most arrogant to build such a superstructure as the Papal, in the power demanded, on so slight a foundation. Thus the controversy, marshaling to its aid the mighty and learned of the earth, shedding in its defence the blood of multitudes arrayed in opposing armies, striking down its victims by the cruel hand of persecution, went on until the Reformation, neither party gaining a decided advantage,* although, as history teaches, it materially aided in preparing men to appreciate the voice and labors of Luther and his co-adjutors, for the agitation of these questions, and the conflicts arising therefrom, had insensibly, gradually, but surely, undermined the authority of the Popes, so that the Hildebrandic thun-

modern customs. &c., of barbarians ascribed to the more elegant Romans of the early age, the words of Jerome's Version quoted by men who lived centuries before him, that Roman Catholics never refer to them as proof. See Mosheim, Vol. II, p. 64, but particularly Bower's *His. Popes*, Vol. I. p. 6 and 7. These decretals, pretending to be the work of the immediate and regular successors of St. Peter, did more to confirm the supremacy derived from the Gelasian interpretation of Matt. 16 : 18, 19, than all other arguments combined.

* Whilst advantages were gained by one or the other party, yet they were either temporary or undecided, for so long as the spiritual supremacy was acknowledged by the nations, the Papacy occupied a position enabling it, by imitating its previous history, to retrieve its fortunes. When nations were separated from its communion, the Bible was circulated and knowledge increased, it was morally impossible, as prophecy predicted, for Popery to recover its lost ground. The mind, released from its bondage, would be no warrant of safety; an open Bible and the providence of God manifested in a protesting flock, is our only hope. Erasmus might be regarded as an exponent of the former; Luther, of the latter. If any one should object to Erasmus occupying such a position, I am willing to substitute High Churchism, as developed in the Puseyistic movement.

der, once feared by emperors, was changed into a Leonie growl, that hurt no one but Leo himself. The last remark indicates that this contest had prepared the minds of many to doubt, if not to deny, the Papal supremacy, and when Luther and the other Reformers entered the arena of strife, their noble words found an echo in hearts previously disposed to accept the truth. The personal reputation of many of the Pontiffs, the vices of the clergy, the arrogance of the monks, and the gross superstition and practices tolerated, had served to confirm the impressions derived from the discussion of this subject. But these alone, as seen by the history of the dark ages, would never have sufficed to break the Papal fetters, for corrupt kings and princes, if only secured in their temporal possessions, were ready to give treasure and blood to support a spiritual supremacy. Something more was required to prepare the powerful, the learned and the masses for the Reformation, that great, decisive protest against the primacy and the supremacy. This was furnished in the dispute concerning the meaning of these words of Christ to Peter. Whilst we may not, indeed, admire the selfish motive, self-protection being the most prominent, which influenced kings, princes, and many others, to investigate the matter; whilst we may reject the weakness, manifested in this conflict by the mighty and learned, who were willing to sacrifice the truth, if only a portion of error was discarded; yet these men, perhaps unconsciously, were, in the Divine Providence, so many pioneers, preparing the way for the Reformers. It was under their influence that men were urged to go to the fountain head, the Scriptures, for information, that copies and versions of the gospels were circulated to aid the inquirer, that the works of the early fathers were carefully investigated, &c. The truth thus developed, although partially concealed, by the learned languages, from the masses, and, in part, suppressed, by interest or fear, was faithfully pondered by many a heart yearning for deliverance from Papal oppression. God thus prepared the age for the open, unselfish, truthful utterances of Luther, Zwingle and their associates in a common cause.

When the German, Swiss, English, Scotch and Dutch Reformers respectively entered the field of contest, this passage, the stronghold of Papal primacy, supremacy and infallibility, was most carefully scrutinized, compared with ancient MSS., the analogy of faith, the opinions of the

Fathers, and it became one of the most important subjects in their discussions, being, in fact, the main prop or foundation on which many of the theses and antitheses of the disputants were placed. It is remarkable to trace how even the Reformers themselves were forced to give this passage that consideration which its prominence demanded. Acknowledging, as we do, the essential aid given by all the other Reformers, we select Luther as an example to illustrate how circumstances, beyond their control, superinduced by an irresistible Providence to fulfil the spoken word in finding its "mate," urged them on and on, until they boldly and unhesitatingly denied *in toto* the Gelasian and Hildebrandic interpretation of the passage. The Church historians, Mosheim, Neander, Kurtz, D'Aubigne, &c., as well as the writers of that age, all testify that, whilst a reformation was desired by many, both in the head and the members of the Church, yet it was not thought desirable to have the constitution and organization of the Church materially changed. It was thought sufficient to set some bounds to the authority and ambition of the Popes, to correct certain abuses, impositions, and immoralities, whilst the Pontiff, only amenable to a general council, should retain a spiritual primacy and supremacy, the doctrines, rites and ceremonies, rendered sacred by the voice of holy fathers, saints and councils, should remain in force, and the bishops, inferior clergy and monks, should, subjected alone in certain temporal contingencies, be under the jurisdiction of the head of the Church. At this distance from the scene of action, calmly contemplating the corruption then existing, we are surprised that no one, who entered the lists against the hierarchy, at first appreciated the truth, so clearly unfolded by the consequences following, that such reforms could never be effected without removing the absurd, fundamental opinion of Papal primacy and supremacy. All of the corruption extant was inseparably connected with this doctrine, for it had received its authority, its vitality, from the sanctions, decrees, acts, &c., of that supremacy and accompanying infallibility. To touch these impositions, burdens, vices, &c., was to call into question the Pope's authority, given to him as a successor of St. Peter. Thus it happened to Luther: when, influenced by the audacious Tetzels, he penned the memorable Ninety-five Theses, whilst indirectly and virtually attacking the Pope, his lan-

guage indicates that he, desirous to remove some abuses, still regarded with favor the privileges, dignity and honor of the professed Head. He had, however, already fatally committed himself. Tetzel, unable to defend himself, throws himself, skilfully, behind the Papal supremacy. He obtains the aid of Wimpina to draw up a series of antitheses, and, in the second of these series, defends, by numerous propositions, the Papal authority as contained in the Dictate of Hildebrand.* In this way a shield of formidable construction was thrown around the doctrine of indulgences, and the attack is, if continued, transferred from the humble Tetzel against the most holy Father. Prierias, Hochstraten, and Eck, the defenders of supremacy, impelled the consideration of the main question. Luther takes up his theses, and gives a series of explanations, called solutions, and in these we first discover his views respecting the Papal authority. He announces: "I listen to the Pope as pope, that is, when he speaks in the canons, or regulates any matter conjointly with a Council, but not when he speaks of his own mind." "I must needs wonder at the simplicity of those who have said that the two swords in the gospel represent, the one the spiritual, the other the temporal, power. True it is, that the Pope holds a sword of iron, and thus offers himself to the view of

* I give only the third one as a specimen of the spirit of the second series: "Christians should be taught, that the Pope, in the plenitude of his power, is higher than the universal Church and superior to Councils; and that entire submission is due to his decrees." *D'Aubigne, His. Ref., Vol. I, p. 269*, quotes a number of them. I have no sympathy with the opinion, so general, that Tetzel's defence was a failure. Whilst Tetzel himself had little learning and ability, yet, aided by others, he brought forth a series of theses, which, had they been defended, would have materially hastened events and, perhaps, humanly speaking, crushed Luther under Papal and civil authority. Luther saw the danger, and did not, at that period, directly attack the theses on the primacy and supremacy. It appears to me providential that these theses were given into the hands of so weak a man as Tetzel, for he, flying from the vantage ground possessed without a discussion, was instrumental in calling up, in all its imposing danger, the protecting power over doctrine, which the Pope claimed, and thus directed the minds of Luther, and others, to consider and study that connection. Tetzel's fleeing saved Luther from a direct, open antagonism to the Pope.

Christians, not as a tender father, but as an awful tyrant. Alas! God, in his anger, has given us the sword we preferred, and withdrawn that which we despised. Nowhere, in all the earth, have there been more cruel wars than among Christians. Why did not the same ingenious critic who supplied this fine commentary, interpret the narrative of the two keys, delivered to St. Peter, in the same subtle manner, and establish, as a dogma of the Church, that one serves to unlock the treasury of heaven, and the other the treasures of this world." The Pope's infallibility is thus expressly denied, his amenability to canons or councils asserted, and a shade cast over his assumption of supremacy. Fearful that he might be regarded presumptuous, and still willing to concede a primacy and sovereignty, the latter limited, in some respects, he pens two letters, one to the Bishop of Brandenburg, and the other to Leo X., in which we read that he regarded the corruptions then existing, a compromising of the Pope's holiness, that, conscious of his integrity, he submitted himself to the Pope, saying, (to Leo): "All those who desire it, may here see with what simplicity of heart, I have petitioned *the supreme authority* of the Church to instruct me, and what respect I have manifested for *the power of the keys*." "Destroy my cause, or espouse it; pronounce either for, or against, me; take my life, or restore it, as you please; I will receive *your voice as that of Christ himself, who presides and speaks through you*." How these expressive words reveal, when contrasted with the preceding, the struggle going on in Luther's mind, and his unwillingness to strike down the remaining barrier, which alone intervened to defend the authority of the Popes, in Luther's eyes and that of the multitude. Against this last bulwark Luther, unwillingly, was pushed by the friends of Leo X., and, finding no retreat, overthrew it, to the consternation of his enemies. After some crafty schemes to silence Luther, by placing him in the power of the Pope at Rome, and which failed, it was arranged that he should appear, to answer for his conduct and teaching, before the Pope's Legate, Thomas De Vio. In the first interview, this crafty General of the Dominicans, this courtly Cardinal of Rome, well knowing the secret history of Papal primacy, supremacy and infallibility, and afraid that the flimsy foundation upon which it was erected, might be unduly exposed, as it

had partly been, through the ever zealous exertions of some of its well-meaning friends, carefully abstained from charging Luther with holding erroneous views respecting it. In the disputation, Leo, however, is made to appear. When Luther firmly declines to receive the Constitution of Pope Clement and the scholastic divines, as superior in authority to the Holy Scriptures, De Vio says: "The Pope has authority and power over all things." Luther replies: "Save the Scriptures." To this, De Vio rejoins: "Save the Scriptures! * * Do not you know that the Pope is higher than the Councils, for he recently condemned and punished the Council of Bâle." Luther, taking refuge in one of the providential provisions previously adverted to, significantly answers: "But the University of Paris has appealed against his decision." The Lion, through the Cardinal, retorts: "Those gentlemen of Paris will receive their desert." In the second interview, realizing from the experience derived in the first that he must either retract or suffer, in a written protest, he says: "I declare myself willing to submit my theses to the decision of the four Universities of Bâle, Fribourg in Brisgau, Louvain, and Paris, and to retract whatever they shall declare to be erroneous." This was a step in advance and directly opposed to the Pope's claimed jurisdiction. In the last interview, in his written protest, or defence, replying to the Legate's reliance on Papal authority, he, shielded by the testimony of Ives, Bishop of Chartres, author of the collection of ecclesiastical law, called *Panormia*, writes: "*Panormitanus*, in his first book, declares, that, in what pertains to our holy faith, not only a general council, but even a private Christian, is above the Pope, if he can adduce clearer testimony from the Scriptures, and better reasons." He, afterwards, adds: "The righteousness of Christ is applied to the faithful, not by indulgences, not by the Keys, but by the Holy Ghost alone, and not by the Pope." A few days after he wrote a letter to the Legate, in which he expresses his regret that he had not manifested (guarded by the words, "as they tell me,") "sufficient diffidence, gentleness and respect for the name of the sovereign pontiff," asks pardon for having thus transgressed, and concludes: "I, therefore, in all humility and submission, entreat you to refer this matter, hitherto so unsettled, to our most holy Lord, Leo X., in order that the Church may decide, pronounce and ordain, and that those who shall be called

on to retract, may do so with a good conscience, or believe in all sincerity." Several days after, apprehensive of his safety, and at the earnest solicitation of his friends, he withdrew from Augsburg, after leaving an appeal to the Pope, legally drawn up by the Imperial Notary.* In all this we see, that, whilst he felt and confessed that the supremacy was perverted in the upholding of pernicious doctrines and errors, yet, inclined by earlier convictions, the prevailing usage and the opinion that the primacy and some kind of supremacy was due to the Pope, he was unwilling, disinclined to make that subject the object of a distinctive attack. Hence, it was only after seeing, at Nuremberg, the brief the Pope had sent to the Legate,† after reading De Vio's arrogant letter to the Elector Frederick, demanding that Luther should be either sent to Rome or banished from his territories, that in sending to Link the report of the conference at Augsburg, he wrote those memorable lines, that excited the wrath of the hierarchy, respecting the Antichrist.‡ Some have thought that this

* See D'Aubigne's His. Ref., Vol. I, p. 372, and the excellent reflections appended to his remarkable letter to Leo. On account of the apparent contradictions in Luther's conduct, at this time, various solutions have been sought. Mosheim, Eccl. His., Vol. III, p. 24, says briefly: "The result of the discussion was, that Luther, previously to his departure from Augsburg," (where the interviews were held,) "*in perfect consistency with the dignity of the Pontiff*, appealed from the Pontiff, ill-informed, to the same, when better informed." Schlegel, in a foot note, more in detail, explains: "*Luther appealed a Pontifice male informato ad melius informandum; a legal step, which was no wise harsh, and one which is resorted to at the present day by persons who do not question the infallibility of the Pope. By this appeal, he recognized the jurisdiction of the Pope, and, at the same time, secured this advantage, that the Cardinal, as a delegated judge, had no longer jurisdiction of the case.*" This is the true solution, and fully meets the objections alleged by Romanists on this point. It accords with what preceded and followed.

† He then said: "It is impossible to believe that any thing so monstrous can have emanated from the Sovereign Pontiff."

‡ His language is so peculiar and illustrative of the phase that I am endeavoring to trace, that the reader will indulge me in copying the well known words: "I send you this document; it cuts too deep, no doubt, to please the Legate; but my pen is ready to give out much greater things. I myself know not whence these thoughts come to

reproachful epithet of Antichrist, thus applied, indicates that he was then ready to refuse any primacy and supremacy to the Popes, but with this conjecture we cannot concur, because others, who strictly accorded this authority, denounced individual Popes in even stronger language, and we are reminded of Louis XII., enraged at the deceitful policy of a Pope, striking off a medal with the legend, *Perdam Babylonis nomen*. As we continue to follow Luther's career, looking at it in this aspect, we find that the next step is precipitated by the anticipated action of the Pope's authority. De Vio had threateningly said: "The Pope's little finger is stronger than all the princes of Germany put together;" and he had already, to some extent, experienced that this was no idle menace. Foreseeing from the intimations given, that the Pope would employ the power vested in him, as supreme governor, to legalize the doctrines denounced by him, he wisely forestalls the Pope's action, by solemnly appealing, on the 28th of November, 1518, from the Pope to a General Council of the Church. On the 13th of December,* same year, Cardinal De Vio published, at Lintz, the Papal decree, in which the doctrine of indulgences is absolutely, in all points, reaffirmed and confirmed by the weight of supremacy. This appeal of Luther from Wittenberg, is, to my mind, the real, substantial starting point of the Reformation. The previous contests respecting the theses, running over a period of a year, was a kind of desultory warfare. The outposts were, indeed, assaulted, just as they had been by others, perhaps not so sharply, but the camp was not directly attacked. Certain doctrines were impugned, but the See that promulgated and established them, was not

me. As far as I can see, the work is not yet begun; so little reason is there for the great men of Rome hoping to see an end of it. I shall send you what I have written, in order that you may judge, if I am right in believing that the Antichrist of whom St. Paul speaks, now reigns in the court of Rome. I think I can prove that nowadays the power that presides there, is worse than the Turks themselves."

*The bull is dated the 9th of November, but was not published by the Legate until the 13th of December. By observing this, the statements of historians are easily reconciled, as some mention the one date without noticing the other. We also see the wisdom, viewed legally, of Luther's action, according to the forms then in vogue.

directly assailed, until Luther, by this public appeal, denies the authority of the Pope to judge him in these matters of doctrine. Leaving an opportunity for future reconciliation, if the Pope so wished, by adopting a limited power, in expressing a respect for the authority of the Papal See, and the Pope duly or better informed, he pointedly says: "But, seeing that the Pope, who is God's vicar upon earth, may, like any other man, fall into error, commit sin, and utter falsehood, and that the appeal to a General Council is the only safeguard against acts of injustice which it is impossible to resist,—on these grounds, I find myself obliged to have recourse to it." Whatever may have been the Pontiff's motive in publishing such a bull, it was a fatal mistake in thus changing Luther's hostile attitude from doctrines of little importance* in comparison with the great, underlying, vital one of supremacy, to a doctrine which, of all others, should deprecate open discussion. Leo, soon discovering the blunder, and aware from Luther's appeal, that he was a man not easily intimidated by his St. Peter derived power, changed his tactics.† He employs another Legate, Charles Von Miltitz to negotiate with Luther. Although the flattery, kisses, and blandishment of Miltitz were appreciated by Luther at their

* Of course, I mean as they relate to the subject in hand, the safety and authority of the Roman Church, in the person of the Vicar. For, the doctrines directly pertaining to salvation, immensely superior in all respects, do not fall within the province of this dissertation.

† Various reasons are assigned for this change, such as the Pope's dread of the Elector's disposition and increasing powers, or his fear of public opinion and the spirit of the age, or his desire to manifest moderation, (D'Aubigne and Roscoe, see the former's *His. Ref.*, Vol. II, p. 8,) but, whilst all such resolve themselves into mere conjecture, I would suggest one, more plausible to my mind than any other I have seen, viz.: the Pope's fear lest his pretensions to the primacy and supremacy should be ventilated and exposed by a public discussion. The proof in favor of such an opinion, is found in the fact that when Dr. Eck, shortly afterwards, held that five days' discussion with Luther, respecting the primacy and supremacy, he was most severely censured by the Papal court for dragging such a subject into controversy. We may rest assured, that the question, in all its bearings, owing to the assaults of kings, bishops, Universities, &c., was well understood by the crafty hierarchy. Even the defining, anathematizing Council of Trent, passed by this point, as too delicate.

true value, he was prompted,—by the desire of securing peace, by the solicitations of friends, and, above all, by anticipating the dangerous topics affecting the authority of the Papal See, which would inevitably arise, if the dispute was pressed,—to agree to terms, in which, as Mosheim concisely states it, “he promised to be silent, provided his enemies would also be silent.” He was even persuaded to write a dutiful letter to Leo X., in which, agreeably to the terms contracted with the Legate, he expressed his unwillingness “to weaken the power of the Roman Church, or of his Holiness,” and emphatically declared that he could not retract his utterances, giving two reasons, viz.: that his writings were published and engraven in the hearts of men, and that a retraction would only dishonor the Church of Rome * Luther’s conduct at this crisis, regarded by some as reprehensible, was entirely consistent, for, to avoid a public schism, he was ready, without yielding his own convictions, to remain silent.† The studies that he prosecuted during this period of silence, shows that he had no confidence in its continuance on the part of his enemies, and that he was preparing himself for the struggle on the main question of the supremacy, beneath which all others gathered strength, and which, he knew, must, sooner or later, come. He carefully examined the *decretals* of the

* It will provoke a smile to notice how the proud Pontiff, assumed that the vital question was safe, swallowed his wrath at the refusal to retract, and even condescended to honor Luther with a kind letter. See Mosheim, Vol. III, p. 24, foot note.

† The reader will, no doubt, be pleased to re-peruse the language of Luther, defining, at this period, his opinion respecting the Roman Church. “That the Roman Church is more honored by God than all others, is not to be doubted. St. Peter, St. Paul, forty-six Popes, some hundreds of thousands of martyrs, have laid down their lives in its communion, having overcome hell and the world, so that the eyes of God rest on the Roman Church with special favor. Though now-a-days everything there is in a wretched state, it is no ground for separating from it. On the contrary, the worse things are going, the more should we hold close to it; for it is not by separation from it, that we can make it better. We must not separate from God on account of any work of the devil, nor cease to have fellowship with the children of God, who are still abiding in the pale of Rome, on account of the multitude of the ungodly,” &c. D’Aubigne’s *His. Ref.*, Vol. II, p. 18.

Popes, and, writing to Spalatin, says: "I am reading the decretals of the Pontiffs, and, let me whisper it in your ear, I know not whether the Pope is Antichrist himself, or whether he is his apostle; so misrepresented and even crucified, does Christ appear in them." The decretals strengthened the views he had already entertained respecting the meaning of Matt. 16 : 18, 19, and furnished him with a knowledge requisite for the impending contest.* That combat was hastened by the ill-directed zeal and amazing rashness of Dr. Eck. Impelled by personal motives, to secure a scholastic triumph, Dr. Eck entered into a controversy with Luther, on a subject, of all others, the most dangerous, that of Papal primacy and supremacy. If defeated, it would be the most fatal blow yet received, seeing that the entire superstructure must fall with it; if unconquered, it was still impolitic to agitate a subject of that kind in such a critical time. The truce, however, was broken by the Papal party, in opposition to the wishes of the Head of the Roman Church, and, for five days, Eck and Luther contended for the mastery.† The result is too well known to need a description. The main struggle between the disputants was that relating to the meaning of Matt. 16 : 18, 19. After some desultory skirmishing over the necessity of the Church having a Head, sacerdotal unity, Dr. Eck says: "Well, to come to the point. The venerable doctor requires from me a *proof* that the primacy of the Church of Rome is of divine right. I find that proof in the words of Christ: '*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,*' &c., and to sustain his position in thus interpreting the passage, quotes some of the fathers, decretals, &c. Luther replies that the passage ought not to be thus expounded, and in proof of his interpretation, adduces the testimony of Scripture, of the Fathers, Church History, and the decrees of the Council

* For he says: "*I restrain myself, and, out of regard to the Elector and the University, I keep back many things which I would employ against Babylon, if I were elsewhere. O, my dear Spalatin, it is not possible to speak truth concerning Scripture and the Church, without rousing the beast.*"

† See the animated description given by D'Aubigne, and the summary in Bower's Life of Luther. The five days were consumed in discussing the primacy and supremacy, the rest of the time was occupied on other subjects—indulgences, purgatory, &c.

of Nice.* The manner in which the latter explained the passage, will hereafter appear. Suffice it to say, that this notable contest, not only confirmed Luther in his views, and added strength to his assaults, but is recognized, distinctly specified by himself, as the period of his disenthralment from Papal authority.† By a little reflection, we can readily see how largely the interpretation of this passage affected the Reformation and the world. The attack on the Papal power (from which aspect, the Reformation had many, we only are regarding the subject at present) commenced by opposing its corruptions and doctrines, but now the Head of that power was directly impeached and found guilty of fearful encroachments. The lopping off of the branches was now exchanged for the felling of the trunk that supported them. No wonder that Luther esteemed this a remarkable epoch in his history. The rottenness of the trunk being thus fully exposed, it amply corroborated what he had said respecting the deadness of the branches. The eyes of many were opened to see that the authority, which established and legalized so many rites and ceremonies, so many doctrines and corruptions antagonistic to the

* It provokes a smile to notice how Dr. Eck resorted to a trick, not entirely discarded at the present day. When he found Luther better posted in the Fathers than himself, and that the quotations adduced by him were overwhelming and damaging, he tried to link Luther's opinion with that of the Hussites, to give it the odor of "heresy." In this connection I may add, that we cannot sufficiently admire the moderation, prudence and humility of Luther in the opening sentence of this discussion: "In the name of the Lord. Amen. I declare that the respect I have for the Sovereign Pontiff, would have prevented my sustaining the part I am taking in this discussion, had not the worthy Dr. Eck persuaded me thereto." To understand this language fully, we must bear in mind that, at the time of this public disputation, he, although rejecting the divine right of the Pope, his supremacy over temporal things, and, to a large extent, over ecclesiastical affairs, still was willing to acknowledge that he was the first Bishop, or Chief Magistrate, in spiritual things, provided he was chosen, elected by the free consent of the Church. The Pope's claim to a precedence, was thus based on the legislative action of the Church, and not on a divine right.

† In his last letter to Leo X., he likewise assures the Pope, that "upon him (Dr. Eck) must lay the blame of the defeat, which has covered Rome with shame," &c.

Scriptures, was more than suspicious,—that it was an authority self-derived, unsupported by Scripture, derogatory to Christ, blasphemous in its nature, and cruelly destructive in its operation. It brought out Melancthon in his first theological writing, in which he upholds the interpretation given by Luther to this passage, by producing the various explanations of the Fathers. It enlightened kings, princes and statesmen, and gave them boldness to present protests, write out lists of grievances, call for reformation, and demand a General Council. Whilst the more firmly establishing the faithful, advantage was taken of it, even by the enemies of the Reformers, to humble the Pope. It would be easy to direct attention to a number of circumstances illustrative of this, but, having presented this phase at greater length than originally intended, we must let the reader recall them to his memory. It would also be interesting to trace out how Zwingli and other men, gradually influenced to ascend from the corruptions to the Head that shielded them, but the example already presented; sufficiently indicates how difficult it was for them to rid themselves of the exposition of a passage of Scripture, which was strengthened by custom, Councils, venerable Bishops, Popes, and the acquiescence of centuries.

In our next article we shall proceed to state the views entertained by the Reformers concerning this passage, the opinions broached since their time to the present, and then present, continuously in detail, an interpretation derived from these sources. This Scripture deserves special attention, seeing the important part that it has been made to take in bending under the Papal yoke, and in delivering from the Papal sway, the intellect and power of nations.*

* For instance, the Sorboune, the distinguished school of Paris, before which, previously, Dr. Allman refuted, with applause, De Vio's work on the absolute monarchy of the Pope. Even Erasmus, whatever may have been his private views, (we have plain hints) owing to his knowledge of the sentiments of the Fathers, bowed beneath the yoke; and it is a striking peculiarity, that, when ultimately forced by the pressure of friends, kings and the Pope, to enter the lists against Luther, he selects for his subject, not the boasted primacy and supremacy, under whose sheltering wing the doctrines were protected, not even one of the abuses or corruptions fiercely assailed by many pens,

ARTICLE VIII.

SERMONIZING.

By Prof. HENRY ZIEGLER, D. D., Selinsgrove, Pa.

This article is the result of eleven years' study and teaching. It is given to the *Review*, at present, not because it is regarded as perfect, but at the Editor's urgent request to furnish an article, and that I may receive suggestions for its improvement from ministers and teachers of riper experience than myself.

I. The Technical Terms, by which the several Methods of Sermonizing are designated.

Three methods of Sermonizing are usually given by writers on Homiletics. These methods are designated by various technicalities:

1. *The Sermon, the Paraphrase, and the Homily.* The *Sermon* has for its foundation a regular theme, whether deduced from a text, or selected independently of any text. The discussion is always confined to the theme. By the *Paraphrase* is meant, a continuous exposition of a passage of Scripture, following its consecutive order. The *Homily* consists in analyzing and expounding a somewhat extended text, in such a manner as to make prominent its principal idea, or ideas, aiming, however, always to preserve unity in the discourse. It, consequently, touches but slightly, or not at all, those points, which are either not essential to, or which are subversive of, said unity.

2. *The Synthetic, the Analytic, and the Analytico-Synthetic Methods.* In the *Synthetic* method, we construct—we unite the scattered elements, so as to form a compound—in short, we select a theme, and then confine our discus-

but the one on Free Will; which, highly important, in many respects, and thus appreciated by Luther, indicates that, knowing what he did, he could not, dared not, venture on a vindication of doctrines based on a sandy foundation. He, fearful of the consequences, could remain silent and wear the shackles.

sion to it. This is synonymous with the Sermon. *In the Analytic method*, we take apart—we expound the text in its consecutive order. It corresponds with the Paraphrase. *In the Analytico-Synthetic method*, we combine the two foregoing. We select a text and deduce from it a theme; in this it is synthetic. We then explain the text, deriving our divisions and discussion from it; either from its language or from its subject-matter; in this it is analytic. This is very nearly synonymous with the Homily.

3. *The Topical and Textual Methods.* *In the Topical method*, we select either a theme, independently of any text, or, a passage of Scripture as a text, and deduce a theme from it. This theme is then made the basis of the subsequent discussion. This, consequently, covers the same ground as the Sermon, or the Synthetic method. *In the Textual method*, we select a text for the basis of the sermon. We discuss this text, and derive from it all the general divisions, and, not unfrequently, also the subdivisions of the discourse. This includes both the Paraphrase and the Homily—consequently, also, the Analytic and Analytico-Synthetic methods. We prefer the terms, *Topical* and *Textual*, to designate the usual methods of Sermonizing. We sometimes speak also of the *Topico-Textual* method. But as this is simply a combination of the other two methods in the same sermon, it needs no explanation. The Topical method must enter, more or less, into every Textual discussion—that is, many general divisions which require subdivisions, must be treated topically. It may be here stated, that only those texts should be treated textually, which afford an interesting discussion founded on the divisions developed in them.

The design of the Textual method is: *a.* To ascertain the mind of the Spirit, viz: the doctrine, duty, or point of experience inculcated in the text; and, *b.* To apply this ascertained mind of the Spirit, for the benefit of the hearers. The design of the Topical method is: *a.* To present the teaching of the Bible on a definite subject; and, *b.* Also to apply it for the benefit of the hearers. We benefit our hearers by enlightening their understanding, by moving, changing, purifying and directing their affections, and by influencing the will.

II. General Directions on Sermonizing.

1. *On the Different Classes of Themes.* Themes, wheth-

er deduced from texts or adopted independently of any text, will divide themselves into three species: *a.* Themes consisting of a simple or complex subject, without the aspects under which they are to be discussed, viz.: of a simple substantive term; or, of several terms, the one being generic, and the other, or others, specific, and so related to each other, that the latter limits and determines the sphere of the former. These we designate *subject-themes*. Such themes are, Justification, Human Depravity, the Deity of Christ, Christ as a Son. *b.* Themes consisting of a subject, and the several aspects under which they are to be discussed. As these aspects are so many topics of discussion, we designate such themes, *Topical themes*. As examples, we give, *The Nature of Justification*, *The Evidences of the Deity of Christ*. *c.* Themes consisting of a regular logical proposition. These we designate *Propositional themes*. Such are—Salvation without Christ, Impossible; God, the Rewarder of his Faithful People.

2. *On the Different Classes of Texts.* Texts may be classified on various principles: *a.* According to their subject-matter. This would give us doctrinal, practical, and experimental texts. *b.* On the manner of presenting their subject-matter, viz.: as a teacher, a historian, or a prophet. We would thus have didactic, historical, and prophetical texts. Didactic texts include the three kinds under the first classification; the same may be said of historical and prophetical texts. In regard to these two latter classes, it is important that the preacher direct his attention to the doctrines, duties, points of experience, traits of character, or general principles involved in them; and also, that he inquire to what extent their teachings are modified by their relating to individuals, communities, or nations. Concerning prophetical texts, the following additional remarks may be of service: Never select such as are obscure, and whose actual fulfilment is involved in much doubt. Again, point out distinctly the circumstances of actual fulfilment. *c.* According to the style in which the subject-matter is dressed, viz.: *Literal and Figurative* texts. Figurative texts must be carefully explained, and will require special attention. Again, texts may be classified, *d.* According to the kinds of propositions which they contain. Thus we would have texts of simple, complex, and compound propositions; also, texts of complex and compound propositions united; texts consisting of several propositions and those consisting of whole

paragraphs or chapters. Examining texts in this aspect, particular attention should be given to the connection and relation of their several terms and parts to each other. This will call into requisition our knowledge of grammar and logic. *e.* According to the kinds of themes which they will afford, viz: subject-themes, 1 Jno. 4 : 8; topical themes, Rom. 12 : 1; Rom. 3 : 1, 2; propositional themes, Acts 4 : 12; and several themes of the same kind or of different kinds, Josh. 24 : 15; Ps. 73. It is impossible to lay down rules, by which we can determine what kinds of texts will give these several classes of themes—the actual investigation of each text will be the best and only way of deciding this point. It may, however, be stated: (1) That a text consisting of a simple proposition, whose predicate affirms but an attribute or property of its subject, will afford only a subject-theme, or the first variety of the propositional theme; and, (2) That a text, consisting of any other proposition, or of several propositions, will afford, sometimes a topical theme, sometimes a propositional, and sometimes several themes. *f.* According to the methods of Sermonizing to which they are best adapted—the *Textual* or *Topical*. Some texts are best adapted to the one method, and some to the other—indeed, many texts can not be treated Textually, they will afford only a theme for discussion.

III. Four General Rules for making Skeletons.

Rule 1. The Theme. Select a theme independently of any text; or, having selected a text, analyze it and state, in a definite theme, the doctrine, duty, point of experience, trait of character, incident, or general principle taught in it. Sometimes it will be advisable and necessary to deduce several themes from the same text and make them the basis of a sermon, or, of two or more consecutive sermons.

The principal characteristics of a theme, are: *a.* Its essential elements, *interest* and *unity*; and, *b.* Its rhetorical elements, *perspicuity*, *comprehensiveness*, *precision* and *dig-nity*.

Rule 2. The Divisions. The divisions will sometimes be found in the text itself, either expressed or implied, and should, therefore, generally be included in the theme; but, whether found in the text or not, they must always be legitimately deduced from the theme. The divisions should

generally be few—not more than from three to five. They should be natural and not artificial; and they should, like the theme, be perspicuous, comprehensive, precise, and dignified. To analyze a text, in order to deduce from it a legitimate theme, with its divisions, the following directions will be found useful. Take into consideration the number, quality, and modality of the propositions; the matter and quantity of their terms; and the relations of the terms and propositions to each other, and also to implied topics. *a.* I here include in the term, *propositions*, more than mere logical propositions, viz: all forms of speech—categorical, conditional, and disjunctive judgments—also, the command, the question, and the exclamation. *b.* The quality of a proposition is found in the copula, and is either affirmative or negative; and its modality is found in the mood of the verb. *c.* The matter of terms, is their definition, signification, nature, or properties; and, if the term expresses or implies an active operation, also the manner of accomplishing it. The matter is, therefore, the answer to the questions—What? How? By what means? *d.* The quantity of terms—also designated their sphere or comprehension—is the number of individuals or species included in them. This involves the *divisive principle* in logic, which is that which determines us to any particular division of a logical whole, or proposition. Sometimes several principles of division may be applied to the same theme; the divisions thus obtained for the same sermon, must, however, be conducive to didactic and oratorical unity. *e.* The relations of terms and propositions to each other, are various, the most important of which are the following: (1) *The whole and its parts*, viz.: general expressions and their specific parts, elements, or alternate conceptions. (2) *Cause and effect*. This includes also antecedents, and consequents; motives, and the thing done; conditions, and the results consequent on compliance with them. (3) *Identity*, which may be indicated by relative pronouns, synonymous and equipollent terms, and, also, by the answer to a question. (4) *Similarity*. This will include nearly all classes of figures of speech, viz.: the simile, the parable, the metaphor, the hypocatastasis, the allegory, the personification, and the fable. (5) *Difference*, in kind and degree. This is found in all contrasted, antithetic, and contradictory terms and propositions. (6) *Fitness*. This is physical, intellectual and moral. With the

latter two, the preacher is principally concerned. (7) *Circumstances*. These are facts which attend or surround another fact as their principal—such as time, place, age. It may yet be added, that, when the text contains several propositions, sometimes each proposition will constitute one general division; sometimes several propositions constitute one such division, in which case, the propositions thus included under one head, generally constitute subdivisions; sometimes one proposition will give several general divisions; and sometimes one will afford all the general divisions, and the others will be only illustrations, motives, &c., and thus often constitute subdivisions. Again, when the language of the text does not suggest any sub-divisions, and it is desirable to introduce them, they must be derived from the sphere and matter of the divisions to be sub-divided.

Examples.

Prov. 15 : 1. *The Consequences of Mild and Harsh Words*. 1. The Influence of Mild Words. 2. The Consequences of Harsh Words.

Ps. 40 : 1—3. *The Result of Making God our Refuge in Times of Spiritual Trial Illustrated in the Case of David*. 1. The Psalmist's Spiritual Trial. He was "in a horrible pit," &c. 2. He made God his Refuge. He "cried and waited patiently." 3. The Result of making God his Refuge. A. To Himself. a. "The Lord inclined unto me and heard my cry." b. "He brought me * * out of the miry clay." c. He "set my feet upon a rock." d. He "established my goings." e. He "hath put a new song * * even praise unto God." B. To Others. Many seeing it—a. "Shall fear," and b. "Shall trust in the Lord."

Matt. 5 : 44—48. *Love to our Enemies—Its Nature, the Mode of its Manifestation, and the Motives Enforcing it*. 1. *Its Nature*. Love your enemies." 2. *The Mode of its Manifestation*. a. "Bless them," &c. b. "Do good," &c. c. "Pray for them," &c. 3. *The Duty Enforced*. It entitles us to sonship with God. "That ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven." For, (1) God exercises his goodness toward all men. "He maketh his sun * * upon the just and unjust." (2) Merely to return like for like, does not entitle us to sonship with God. "For if ye love them, which love you," &c., vs. 46, 47. (3) Im-

itating our heavenly Father, alone entitles us to this high prerogative. "Be ye, therefore, perfect even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect."

Rule 3. The Matter. Collect materials, and arrange them under appropriate heads, under the general divisions already adopted. Considerable material will already have been collected in analyzing the text in order to deduce from it a theme with its divisions, according to the directions under *Rule 2*. Other directions for the collection of materials, and the laws for their arrangement, are here omitted.

Rule 4. The Application. Make a practical application of your discourse to the circumstances and wants of your hearers. Sometimes the continuous application will be the most natural and effectual; at other times it will be better to defer it for the closing part of the sermon, especially when it belongs properly to its last division. This involves the subject of Hortation, which cannot be here discussed.

Practical Exercises.

On the following and other texts: Rom. 12 : 1; Matt. 11 : 28, 29,—ascertain—1. The several propositions. 2. The theme. 3. The propositions embracing the general divisions of the sermon. 4. Their logical arrangement. 5. The language of the text that suggest sub-divisions. 6. The divisions of the skeleton, thus far completed, which require sub-divisions, and which are not suggested by the text. 7. The sub-divisions themselves.

IV. Specific Rules on Sermonizing.

*Case 1. The Treatment of Subject-themes.** A subject-theme consists of a single substantive term, or of such a term modified by one or several adjuncts, and which adjuncts always limits the sphere of the original and generic substantive term. Subject themes, whether deduced from a text, or adopted independently of any text, must be

* The six cases that follow are all included, essentially, in the first three; for each of the last three, is reducible to one of the first three. This should always be borne in mind, and ought to be frequently tested. The last three cases are, therefore, added, not because their themes do not belong to the three classes of subject,—topical,—and propositional themes, but for the sake of convenience, variety, and practical utility.

treated in the same way—they require, primarily, the method of investigation, involving, however, also the method of proof. In the method of investigation, the subject only is given, and we are required to find the predicates; whereas in the method of proof, the subject and predicate are both given, and we are required to establish the truth of the copula, either as affirmed or denied. The former, then, consists in finding predicates; the latter, in proving the truthfulness or applicability of the predicates, as affirmed or denied, of the subject by the copula.

The methods of investigation that principally concern us are, observation, testimony, analysis, induction, and elimination; and the principal methods of proof are, demonstration, deduction, appeal to authority, and appeal to facts: and here belong also the direct and indirect methods of refutation. In selecting subject-themes, and preparing skeletons on them, observe the following directions:

1. Such a theme must be discussed under one or several of its aspects; and which aspects we designate *its topics*. These topics, consequently, are not themselves subjects for investigation or discussion, they only indicate the various aspects under which any, or all subjects may be discussed.

2. The special design in discussing a subject-theme, must suggest the topics—they will always be derived, however, from the quantity, matter, and relations of the theme.

3. The topics are such terms as the following: *First*. Those indicating the *matter* of the theme, viz.: signification, nature, attributes, character, opinions, elements, alternate conceptions, description, manner of performing. *Second*. *The Quantity*, the topics being the parts of the whole, viz.: individuals, classes, &c. *Third*. *The Cause*, viz.: antecedents, cause, reasons, occasion, instrumentality or means of performing, institution or bringing into existence, motives, encouragements, conditions, remedy. *Fourth*. *The Effects*, viz.: consequences, results, rewards, design, consolations. *Fifth*. *Identity*, viz.: evidence, manifestations. *Sixth*. *Similarity*, viz.: illustrations, counterfeits. *Seventh*. *Difference*, viz.: contrasts. *Eighth*. *Fitness*. The general topic here would be, application or improvement; specifically we would have reasonableness, ground, advantages,

adaption, utility, importance, convenience, persons to whom applicable, possibility of attaining, securing and avoiding, obligation, obstacles, disgrace, and their opposites. *Ninth. Circumstances*, viz.: of time, place, &c.

4. In regard to the topics, both as to number and kind, select: *a.* Those which are most appropriate to the subject; *b.* Those which secure the highest degree of unity in the discussions; and *c.* As many as will answer your special design.

5. When more than one topic is selected, each topic becomes a general division.

6. When only one topic is selected, take as the divisions, either the negative and affirmative aspects of that topic, or, if you discuss it only affirmatively, its several species or individuals, or its matter, or alternate conceptions.

7. The sphere of the topics, when considered in relation to the theme, will constitute the sub-divisions, and their matter, the discussion.

Examples.

Theme. Justification. We proceed to our investigation: *First.* What shall be its topics? *Nature, Ground, Evidences.* *Second.* What are our divisions? 1. The Nature of Justification. 2. The Ground of Justification. 3. The Evidences of Justification. *Third.* We inquire again: 1. The Nature of Justification is, what? 2. The Ground of Justification is, what? 3. The Evidences of Justification are, what? Completing this last inquiry, we have. *a.* A renunciation of our own righteousness. *b.* Committing ourselves to Christ. *c.* Submission to Christ. *d.* Actual obedience to Christ. *Then again:* We inquire: 1. A renunciation of our own righteousness is, what? 2. Committing ourselves to Christ is, what? 3. Submission to Christ is, what? 4. Actual obedience to Christ is, what?

Theme. The Deity of Christ. The topic may be, *evidences.* The divisions on this topic and theme would be: 1. *Divine Names and Titles ascribed to Christ.* 2. *Divine Attributes.* 3. *Divine Works.* 4. *Divine Worship.*

Case 2. The Treatment of Topical Themes. In this Case, the theme consists of two classes of terms—the one class presenting its fundamental idea, and the other giving the several aspects, under which it is to be discussed. The

former, we designate *the subject of the theme*, and the latter, *its topics*. Themes of this class differ from those of *Case 1*, only in this, that the topics are included in the theme; and they are properly always taken from a text. It is not necessary, however, to confine one's self, in all cases, to the number of topics derived from the text. Themes coming under this case, require, in their treatment, as *Case 1*, primarily the method of investigation, involving, however, like it, also the method of proof.

Directions. 1. Select a text, and deduce from it a theme, including in it the topics given in it, and suggested by it. 2. Observe also direction 5, 6, and 7, under *Case 1*.

Examples.

Matt. 22 : 42 : "What think ye of Christ?" *Theme.* *The Character of Christ.* 1. As a Son. 2. As a Companion and Friend. 3. As a Citizen. 4. As a Philanthropist. Jno. 4 : 16—26. Str. Pr. Man., p. 270. *Theme.* *The Design of Christ in giving this Command to the Woman of Samaria.* 1. To Try Her, v. 17. 2. To Reprove Her, v. 18. 3. To Reveal Himself to Her in His True Character. A. As a Prophet. B. As the Messiah.

Practical Exercises. A useful practice on texts is, to give: 1. The theme; 2. The subject of the theme, its modifying adjuncts, and their effects on its principal term; and, 3. The topics of the theme, whether derived from the quantity, matter, or relations of the subject, and the special design in selecting them.

Case 3. The Treatment of Propositional Themes. Themes of this class include four varieties: 1. Those in which both the subject and predicate are specific. 2. Those in which the subject is specific, and the predicate generic. 3. Those in which the subject is generic, and the predicate specific. And, 4. Those in which both the subject and predicate are generic. This class of themes would seem to demand exclusively the Method of Proof, *i. e.*, the subject and predicate being both given, we are required to establish the truth of the copula, as either affirming or denying the relation between these two terms of the propositional theme. But such themes will, sometimes, also require the combination of the two methods of proof and investigation. The method of proof alone will, generally, if not always, be required in the first species of propositional themes, *viz.*: when both the subject and predicate

are specific. First. In this case, the general divisions will consist of the several arguments and facts which prove the truth or applicability of the predicate.

Acts 4 : 12. *Theme. Salvation without Christ, Impossible.* The truth of this theme, results from our relations to the moral government of God. 1. *For Beings who have Sinned, there can be no Salvation without an Atonement.* 2. *No Created Being can make this Atonement.* 3. *Jesus Christ has made an Atonement.* Therefore, 4. *The Sinner must be saved through Christ, or perish.* Second. Both methods are required, when either the subject or predicate, or both, are generic. In these cases, the general divisions will be taken from the quantity or matter of the generic term or terms. In the second species of this kind of themes, the divisions being taken from the generic predicate, the treatment consists, *a.* In finding, by the method of investigation, the several specific predicates which are applicable to the one specific subject; and then, *b.* By the method of proof, in presenting the different arguments and facts which prove the truth or applicability of each of these specific predicates.

Heb. 11 : 6 (last clause). *Theme. God, the Rewarder of His Faithful People.* 1. *He Rewards them in the Present Life.* *A.* By peace of mind. *B.* By affording them the means of moral improvement. *C.* By the assurance of a free salvation. *D.* By the assurance of a glorious reward in heaven, for their labors and sufferings of the present life. 2. *He will Reward them in Eternity.* *A.* By reunion of soul and body. *B.* By immortality. *C.* By freedom from all sin, temptation and suffering. *D.* By companionship with the inhabitants of heaven. *E.* By the administration of his perfect government. In the third species, the divisions being taken from the generic subject, treatment consists, *a.* In finding, by the method of investigation, the several specific subjects, to each of which the one specific predicate is applicable; and then, *b.* By the method of proof, in presenting the arguments and facts which prove the truth or applicability of the one predicate to each specific subject separately, or to all of them collectively.

Titus 1 : 13 (last clause) *Theme. Soundness in the Faith, a Christian Duty.* 1. *Soundness in Theoretic Faith.* *A.* Not merely in the Symbols of the Church. *B.* But especially in the truths of our Holy Christianity. *a.* In

Doctrines. *b.* In Duties. *c.* In Matters of Experience. 2. *Soundness in Practical, or Saving Faith.* *A.* This receives Christ as the only and all-sufficient Saviour. *B.* It includes an entire surrender to Christ. *C.* It implies a willingness to learn of Christ.

Amos 6 : 1 (first clause) *Theme.* *The Doom of those who are at ease in Zion.** 1. *Those who are at ease in Zion.* *A.* Those who are satisfied with their orthodoxy. *B.* Those who are satisfied with their morality. *C.* Those who are satisfied with frames and feelings. *D.* Those who are satisfied with mere formality. 2. *Their Doom.*

Third. In the fourth species of propositional themes, either the subject or predicate will be regarded as a whole—all such themes will, therefore, be treated as the second or third class.

Case 4. The Treatment of Several Themes as one Sermon. In this case, several observations are made on the same text, or several inferences, general principles, &c., are deduced from it, and each one is made a separate head of the sermon. This often results in a distinct discussion of separate themes, not unfrequently having little or no connection with each other. Each such theme must be treated according to case 2, or 3; for they will always belong either to the class of topical or propositional themes.

Rules. 1. State distinctly each observation, inference, or general principle as the case may be, and show how each one is derived from the text. 2. Select only such themes as have some common affinity or relation to each other, in order to preserve unity in the discourse, *i. e.*, let there be a single point, in which all the themes constituting the general divisions of a sermon, find one common centre. 3. When a text is so fruitful as to afford several independent unconnected themes, it would be preferable to preach

* In *form*, this theme belongs to Case 1, but, in *subject-matter and treatment*, it belongs to Case 3. The last modifying adjunct in this theme—the term, “*Doom*”—may be readily changed into a verb, as a regular predicate, of which the subject will be the remaining part of the theme. Thus changed, it will be a regular propositional theme, *viz.*: *Those who are at ease in Zion, Doomed.* A similar example would be the theme from Mark 16 : 16, (last clause). *The Condemnation of Unbelievers*; or, *Unbelievers Condemned.* I prefer the subject-form, in these and similar themes, but they require the propositional treatment.

a separate sermon on each one. This case is often peculiarly adapted to the discussion of parables and types.

Lev. 23 : 43. 1. *There is a State of Blessedness, into which Believers pass immediately after Death.* 2. *Men may Repent and be Prepared for this State of Blessedness immediately before their Dissolution by Death.*

Lev. 16 : 19—31. 1. There is a State of Future Retribution—a Heaven and Hell—and upon which we must enter immediately after Death. 2. Wealth, Honor, &c., cannot save us from Hell. 3. Poverty, Affliction, &c., cannot exclude us from Heaven. 4. The relative Conditions of Neighbors, while on Earth, often change, immediately on their entering on a State of Retribution. 5. The Petitions of the Lost in Hell for the Alleviation of their Sufferings, as also their Intercession for their Friends on Earth, will be Unavailing. 6. Those who reject the Offers of Salvation made by their Living Brethren, would also reject the same offers, if made to them by Persons sent to them from the Dead. The remark made under Rule 2, above, that “there should be a single point in which all the themes, constituting the general divisions of a sermon, should find one common center,” deserves additional notice.

This point can always be expressed in the form of a subject—a topical, or a propositional theme. The exposition of the text, in order to deduce this theme from it, will often constitute the introduction to the sermon—sometimes, its enunciation will be the commencement of the introduction, and the exposition of the text will complete it; at other times, it will be announced only towards the close of the expository introduction. This theme, thus fully presented in the introduction, is not, however, to constitute the regular theme of the sermon—it only expresses the general subject in which the several heads of the sermon, as so many co-ordinate themes, find their common center, from which they radiate; in short, all the general divisions of the sermon are derived from this original theme as their central truth; and the design of these divisions is, a more beneficial application of the original theme to the purposes of practical religion, than could be attained by the usual method of its regular discussion. To make such a use of the original theme, we must ascertain in what way it may be legitimately and profitably applied to the various circumstances, relations, condition,

station, prospects, duties, and trials of man, as also, to the purposes and providence of God.

Examples.

Matt. 21 : 28: "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard." *Original Theme.* Religion, a Personal, Daily Working for Christ. The *derived* themes may be: 1. Religion is not a thing of Fits and Starts, but a Settled Conviction, a Governing purpose, an Active Life-principle. 2. How can we put and Keep our Hearts in Working Order for Christ? 3. The Essential Elements in the Work to be Done.

Luke 2 : 6, 7, and 22—24. *Original theme.* The Lowliness and Poverty of the Birth and Parentage of Christ. *Derived themes.* 1. Lowliness of Birth and Parentage are no Disgrace. 2. They are often a Great Inconvenience. 3. They are not, necessarily, Insuperable Barriers to True Greatness and Extensive Usefulness. 4. They are not unfrequently the Means which God Employs to Preserve one from Ruin, or, to Educate him for Usefulness, or, even for some special Post of Honor and Responsibility.

Case 5. Continuous Analysis. This consists in the consecutive exposition of entire chapters or books of the Bible. It is well adapted to the Lecture-room, and also to Bible-classes.

Rules. 1. Analyze and explain the text in its consecutive order, and exhibit fully the most prominent doctrines, duties, points of experience, facts, or general principles expressed or implied in it. It will be necessary sometimes to deviate somewhat from the consecutive order of the text, in order to secure a more logical arrangement in the discussion, and also more compactness of related parts. 2. Preserve as much *unity* as possible in each lecture—therefore, reject, or treat but slightly, such aspects of the text as are irrelevant to your main design. 3. Show the *connection* between the subjects of the successive lectures, as also between the subject of each lecture and the general scope of the whole book, or the special scope of the context. 4. Make use of the method of investigation or proof, as the nature of each term or proposition of the text may require.

Case 6. Interrogative Discourses. This consist in stating the divisions derived from a text, in the form of questions ; and it will frequently be found the simplest method of treating a text. It requires the method of investigation.

In this method of treatment, the divisions will be the filling up of such questions as the following: Who? What? viz.: the doctrine, duty, promise, threatening, fact, results, condition, &c. How? viz.: openly, privately, effectually, partially, frame of mind, view taken, course pursued, &c. When? Where? For whom? Why? viz.: the motives. By what means? With what results?

Directions. Select as many of these questions as will be necessary to discuss fully the subject-matter of the text, always having reference, however, to unity in the discourse.

Ps. 40 : 1—3. 1. What was the Condition of the Speaker? 2. How did he seek Deliverance? 3. What were the Results of his efforts? A. To Himself. B. To Others?

ARTICLE IX.

Annals of the American Lutheran Pulpit: or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished Clergymen of the Lutheran Denomination in the United States, from its Commencement to the close of the year eighteen hundred and fifty-five. With An Historical Introduction. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.

By. Prof. V. L. CONRAD, A.M., Gettysburg, Pa.

It is a source of congratulation to the American churches, that the publication of the great life-work of Dr. Sprague has been resumed, after a suspension of some years, in consequence of the increased expense of publication incident to the change of times. The ninth volume which has just appeared, embraces the more noted representatives of the Lutheran pulpit in America, from 1734 down to 1855. It is embellished with a fine engraving of Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the distinguished and heroic Lutheran pioneer, whose memory is so widely cherished throughout the Church. The *Historical Introduction* prefixed is a brief but interesting sketch of the growth of the Lutheran

Church in this country, from its earliest settlement by emigration to the present time.

The first Lutherans who came to America, emigrated from Holland to New Amsterdam—now New York—soon after the Dutch began a settlement there in 1621. It is a sad commentary on the intolerant spirit of the age, that during the dominion of the Dutch in New Amsterdam, the Lutherans were obliged to conduct their religious worship in private; and it was not until the British rule began there in 1664, that they enjoyed the right to worship in public.

The next colony of Lutherans was that of the Swedes on the Delaware, at Wicaco, now Southwark, Philadelphia, in 1636. This took place under the administration of Oxenstiern, the illustrious Prime Minister of Gustavus Adolphus.

The third settlement was that of the Germans, in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the interior of New York. In 1710, three thousand more settled on the Hudson, near Rhinebeck. In 1713, a colony located at Schoharie; and in 1717 and 1727, large numbers more settled in Pennsylvania.

The fourth settlement was that of the Saltzsburgers in Georgia, under the patronage of Ogelthorpe, in 1733, and where with the aid of Whitefield, they built the far-famed Orphan House, at Ebenezer, in 1738.

After this, other colonies arrived every few years, from different parts of Continental Europe, and joined the settlements already made.

Amid the perils, privations and rude necessities of frontier life, aggravated often by the hostility of surrounding Indians, these colonists suffered greatly, in a religious aspect, in consequence of having but few pastors, who could serve their churches only at long and irregular intervals.

In 1742, however, they were powerfully re-enforced by the arrival of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, a man of commanding ability and energy, of high culture and intense devotion to the evangelization of his people. The oversight of all the churches which naturally devolved upon him, under the circumstances, rendered his labors among the scattered, and often spiritually disorganized colonists, most arduous, constant and difficult. For nearly half a century, he continued his varied and apostolic labors with

a zeal and energy that never wearied ; and it is to his efforts and influence, more than to those of any other man of that era, that the Lutheran Church is indebted for the organization and establishment of many of its oldest and largest congregations in Pennsylvania.

It was not, however, until after the formation of the General Synod in 1820, that the establishment of Theological Seminaries and Colleges was commenced, and the number of congregations and ministers largely increased. From that epoch forward, the Church began to realize her mission in some degree, and to enter upon her career of duty as a denomination of Christians, with a great work to do in this land. And her increase since then, has been without a parallel among the Protestant denominations of this country.

The following is a list of the divines commemorated in the volume under review :

John Martin Bolzius, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, D. D., Peter Nicholas Sommer, Peter Brunnholtz, John Helfrich Schaum, John Nicholas Kurtz, John Frederick Handschuch, John Christopher Hartwig, John Nicholas Martin, John Dietrich Matthias Heintzelman, John Andrew Krug, John Lewis Voight, Christopher Emanuel Schultze, John Frederick Schmidt, Christian Streit, Justus Henry Christian Helmuth, D. D., John Christopher Kunze, D. D., Henry Ernst Muhlenberg, D. D., Jacob Goering, Henry Mœller, John George Butler, John Ernest Bergman, Frederick David Schaeffer, D. D., William Carpenter, Charles Augustus Gottlieb Stork, Paul Henkel, John George Schmucker, D. D., John F. Ruthrauff, Frederick William Geissenhainer, D. D., Christian Endress, D. D., George Lochman, D. D., Frederick Henry Quitman, D. D., George Daniel Flohr, David Frederick Schaeffer, Jacob Miller, D. D., Ernest Lewis Hazeliu8, D. D., Gottlieb Shober, Frederick Christian Schaeffer, D. D., Michael John Steck, Charles Henkel, John Christian William Yeager, John Peter Goertner, Christian F. Bergman, John W. Richards, D. D., Jacob Wingard, Jacob Berger, Jonathan Ruthrauff, William Schmidt, Nicholas G. Sharretts, Emanuel Keller, John G. Schwartz, David Jacobs, Ezra Keller, D. D., Michael Eyster and Walter Gunn.

The biographical notices are largely made up of personal recollections in the form of letters from intimate friends, and others personally acquainted with them. This

is a peculiar feature of the entire work, and adds greatly to the interest of all the sketches, by presenting real life-like pictures of those whom they commemorate.

The following persons have furnished reminiscences respecting the subjects of the volume :

S. S. Schmucker, D. D., H. H. Muhlenberg, M. D., Rev. P. A. Strobel, H. M. Muhlenberg, D. D., B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D., H. N. Pohlman, D. D., B. N. Martin, D. D., Geo. Lochman, D. D., Philip F. Mayer, D. D., Rev. A. Essick, C. P. Krauth, D. D., J. C. Baker, D. D., John W. Francis, M. D., Augustus Wackerhagen, D. D., Rev. Benjamin Keller, F. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., J. George Schmucker, D. D., Rev. J. Goering Harris, George B. Miller, D. D., Rev. D. H. Focht, J. G. Butler, D. D., Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., C. P. Krauth, Sen., D. D., Prof. M. L. Stoever, Theophilus Stork, D. D., Rev. D. P. Rosenmiller, Rev. Andrew Henkel, John G. Morris, D. D., J. Allen Brown, D. D., George Diehl, D. D., James M. Mathews, D. D., J. Few Smith, D. D., William R. Dewitt, D. D., A. H. Lochman, D. D., Hon. W. C. Bouck, G. A. Lintner, D. D., James A. Brown, E. Greenwald, D. D., Henry I. Schmidt, D. D., Lewis Heyl, Esq., Rev. Daniel Garver, William D. Strobel, D. D., William M. Reynolds, D. D., H. L. Baugher, D. D., Rev. Henry Haverstick, David Gilbert, M. D., James L. Schock, D. D., Rev. J. Ulrich, Samuel Sprecher, D. D., Hon. Edward McPherson, William M. Paxton, D. D., Rev. Jacob Ziegler, J. A. Seiss, D. D., and Charles A. Hay, D. D.

Many readers of the *Evangelical Review* will feel a melancholy interest in recalling the fact, that among the names of those just given, who have furnished recollections to perpetuate the memory of others, are not a few who have themselves, since then, entered upon their reward in the better land. Among these are :

Rev. Drs. Baker, Baugher, Dewitt, Kurtz, Krauth, Sr., Mayer, Schmucker, Sr., Schock, Wackerhagen, Gov. Bouck, Dr. Gilbert, and Rev. Messrs. B. Keller, Focht, Garver and Ulrich.

The aid, afforded by those who have contributed information and matter for the *Annals*, is gratefully acknowledged by the author; especially his indebtedness to the editor of the *Evangelical Review*, who has been engaged for many years in the biographical and general history of

our Church, and whose writing and labors in this department of research are so well known and widely appreciated.

The gratitude of the entire Lutheran Church is due to Dr. Sprague for this emphatic labor of love, in rescuing from oblivion the pioneer worthies of our Zion, and placing them before us as they really lived, labored, suffered and died, while laying the foundations of our Church in the wilderness, and upon whose labors their successors have entered, in more auspicious times. Few at the present day can fully appreciate the peculiar trials and privations which many of them endured. "There were giants in those days."

But apart from the value and interest of this volume to Lutherans, it will serve a good purpose in disseminating among other denominations in this country, a more correct knowledge of the history and character of the Lutheran Church and ministry, in regard to which much misapprehension, ignorance and prejudice still exist. This is due, we are aware, in large measure at least, to the German language, which has heretofore so largely prevailed, and served as a barrier to information and intercourse; and in part, also, to the characteristic neglect of self-assertion, which is peculiar to the German character. It is about time, however, that persons of other denominations, who desire to be regarded as intelligent, should inform themselves more accurately about a Church which is already the third numerically in this country, and which embraces a larger communion throughout the world, than all other Protestant churches combined.

Of Dr. Sprague's qualifications for the work which he has thus far so well executed, there is but one opinion. His unwearied industry and felicitous style; his skill, fidelity and catholic spirit; his judgment, good taste and delicacy, have all become more and more conspicuous with each succeeding volume of his great and difficult work. May he live long enough not only to complete it, but to enjoy for many years the appreciation and gratitude of all the American churches, to the *Annals* of whose ministry he has devoted the chief labors of his life!

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The History of the Augsburg Confession, from its origin till the adoption of the Formula of Concord. By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. 42 N. 9th st. The author during his residence in Germany, and since, has devoted special attention to the full and thorough investigation of the subject. The original authorities are made the basis of his statements. In addition to the Introduction and Appendix, the work embraces the discussion of the following topics: (1) Preparations for the Diet at Augsburg; (2) Genesis of the Confession; (3) Aim of the Protestants in its Preparation; (4) Its Reading; (5) Threatening aspect of affairs after its Reading; (6) Papal Confutations of the Confession; (7) Earnest efforts to come to an agreement on the Differences; (8) Recess and Close of the Diet; (9) Doctrine of the Lord's Supper at Augsburg; (10) Melancthon's Alterations of the Confession; (11) Its authority during the Reformation; (12) Preparation and adoption of the Formula of Concord. We hail with much interest this able discussion, designed to throw light upon the history of the Church and its Confessions.

Illustrations of the Life of Martin Luther. P. H. Labouchere Merle D'Aubigne, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. These illustrations are among the most beautiful that have been issued from the American Press. The artist is well known by his pictures of "Luther, Melancthon, Pomeranus and Cruciger translating the Bible," and "The Conference in 1549," and these twelve scenes connected with the Reformation, will not detract from his well-earned reputation. Dr. D'Aubigne in an animated style, with the pen, describes the pencilings of the artist. Mr. Shryock, the enterprising Superintendent of the Lutheran Board of Publication, is entitled to the gratitude of the whole Church, for his successful efforts in introducing among us so many good books.

The Cottage by the Lake. Translated from the German by Miss R. H. Schively, Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. Our Lutheran Board has done a good work in adding this charming story to our Sunday School literature. The works of Claudius enjoy a popularity in Germany, far beyond most writers in this department of authorship. They are characterized by pathos, tenderness and earnestness of spirit, evangelical piety, and an unflinching trust in God.

Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter. By Rev. John Lillie, D. D. With an Introduction by Phillip Schaff, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The author, a Scotchman by birth, and a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, was one of our best biblical scholars, and a man of decided, positive convictions, and in the work before us are presented the results of a thorough study of

the original text, characterized by all the simplicity, directness and earnestness of pastoral address.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various denominations, from the early settlement of the country to the close of the year 1855. With Historical Introductions. By William B. Sprague, D. D. Vol. IX. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The present issue contains the Lutheran, Reformed Dutch, Associate, Associate Reformed, and Reformed Presbyterian departments of Dr. Sprague's Annals, and the same plan is pursued as in the former volumes. The names here enshrined are among the best and most faithful ministers of the Gospel, many of whom laid the foundation of the Church of Christ in this country. Dr. Sprague will receive, as he so well deserves, the lasting gratitude of the Church in all its branches, for the fidelity and skill with which he has gathered up these interesting memorials.

The Day Dawn and the Rain, and other Sermons. By Rev. John Ker, Glasgow. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. In Scotland the author of these Sermons is regarded as one of the most gifted preachers, a man of genius and varied culture. These discourses, twenty-four in number, embrace the discussion of a wide and varied range of subjects, all revolving around the great central truth of our holy religion, "Christ, and him crucified," and intimately connected with our daily faith and practice.

Lectures on the Pilgrim's Progress, and on the Life and Times of John Bunyan. By George B. Cheever, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. We are glad to see a new edition of this admirable work, so long out of print and so often called for. No one who is interested in Bunyan's great work, can very well afford to do without this valuable accompaniment.

Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Teachings; Founded on the Four Gospels, and illustrated by reference to the manners, customs, religions, beliefs and political institutions of his times. By Lyman Abbott. New York: Harper & Bros. The philosophy of Christianity, as connected with the life and influence of Christ, has given to the discussion of the subject, at the present day, a peculiar interest. During the last half century more than one hundred treatises have been published on this topic, some of them of unusual extent and power. The work before us is a valuable addition to this department of our literature.

The Life, Times and Travels of St. Paul. By Rev. W. J. Conybeare, A. M. Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Rev. J. S. Howson, M. A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. With Introduction by Matthew Simpson, D. D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Two volumes in one, unabridged. New York: E. B. Treat & Co.; C. W. Lilley, Chicago, Ill.; A. H. Hubbard, Philadelphia. This is a most scholarly and valuable contribution to our theological literature, and without a rival in its special departments. It is a faithful, complete and instructive biography of the Apostle, full of just such information, well digested and reliable, as is necessary to a proper comprehension of his extensive travels and successful labors, the circumstances by which he was surrounded during the whole of his ministerial career, evangelical in its spirit and teachings, and written in clear, beautiful and vivid style. It

possesses a permanent value, generally acknowledged. The original is here published in an unabridged form, and at an exceedingly low price.

The Gospel in Enoch, or Truth in the Concrete. A Doctrinal and Biographical Sketch. By Henry H. Tucker. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This little book contains twenty-nine chapters, some of them quite brief, but each one presenting some truth suggested by the patriarch's holy life and miraculous translation.

Who is He? An Appeal to those who regard with any doubt the name of Jesus. By S. F. Smiley. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. The object of this little book is not to answer the cavils of the sceptic, but to aid the honest inquirer in search of the truth. It is thoroughly scriptural in its character, and recognizes all those practical bearings of the gospel, so essential to the life of the Christian. It is a strong argument for Christ's divine nature and work of atonement. The writer is a prominent member of the Society of Friends.

An Ecclesiastical History, from the First to the Thirteenth Century. By Rev. C. M. Butler, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, West Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The work, written from the author's Episcopal stand-point, is divided into seven periods: (1) The Church of the Apostles; (2) From the Death of the Apostles to Constantine; (3) From the Conversion of Constantine to Gregory the Great; (4) From Gregory the Great to the Death of Charlemagne; (5) From Charlemagne's Death to Gregory VII.; (6) From Gregory the Great to the Concordat at Worms; (7) From the Concordat at Worms to the Death of Innocent III. This volume will be followed by another, bringing the History of the Church down to our time.

The Last Passover. An Account of the closing incidents in the Life, upon earth, of our Lord Jesus Christ. A verbal Harmony of the Four Gospel Narratives. Arranged by John R. Whitney. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The plan of the Harmony differs from similar works, inasmuch as it gives a connected arrangement of the words, not a connected narrative of the events of Gospel history. It seems to have been prepared with care, and, in the study of the Scriptures, will be found of great value.

Golden Links: or Thoughts for the Hours. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This is a handsomely printed book, containing practical thoughts and brief selections, of prose and poetry, from eminent authors, for the days of the month and the twelve hours of the day.

A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, prepared as a solid basis for the interpretation of the New Testament. By Dr. George B. Winer. Seventh edition, enlarged and improved. By Dr. Gottlieb Lüneman, Professor of Theology, at the University of Goettingen. Revised and authorized translation. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Philadelphia: Smith English & Co. A most important service has been rendered in this department of Biblical Philology, Exegesis and Grammar by the republication of this standard work. Its original design was to oppose the license, in which some expositors indulged, who maintained that the original text was often deficient in precision and regularity, and on this basis were disposed to adopt an interpretation of their own. The present edition has been issued with the last revision of Winer; under the faithful supervision

of his former pupil Dr. Lüneman. The translation by Prof. Thayer is a careful reproduction of the original. It is a great work, containing the latest results of modern Philology, which no scholar, who has occasion to use it, can study without profit.

The Evidences of Christianity, with an Introduction on the existence of God, and the immortality of the Soul. By Ebenezer Dodge, D. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. The leading idea of this book, is that Christianity is its own witness; that the nature, influence and relations to Providence and human progress and its historical triumphs, are the best evidence of its divine origin. It is a clear, compact and thoughtful discussion, the substance of the author's lectures, given to the Students of the Senior Class in Madison University, over which he presides, and written in consideration of new phases of infidelity, of living, present controversies. We notice in the work nothing indicating the peculiar ecclesiastical views of the author, except in the restricted definition given to Baptism, and in a remonstrance against a representative principle in connection with families and their relation to the Church.

Night Scenes in the Bible. By Daniel March, D. D. Philadelphia: Ziegler, M'Curdy & Co. This is an elegant octavo, of no ordinary interest and value, abounding in beautiful thought, glowing description, and evangelical sentiment. The author deserves the thanks of the public in bringing within the reach of the people a work of so much beauty and instruction. It is printed on rose-tinted paper, embellished with twelve fine steel engravings, and executed in the highest style of the art.

Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism and on Catholicity. By Ferdinand C. Ewer, S. T. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Dr. Ewer's views are presented in eight discourses: (1) The Failure of Protestantism; (2) The Anglican Church, not Protestant; (3) The Anglican Church Fundamentally Different from the Protestant sects; (4) Protestantism logically destructive of Christianity; (5) Protestantism one of the three great heresies of the Christian era; (6) Catholicity, and its presentment of Christianity, as opposed to the presentment made by Protestantism; (7) Reply to Protestant Criticisms; (8) Practical admissions by Protestants themselves. In this brief notice we have space only to say that the author has signally failed to sustain his general position.

Hades and Heaven; or What does Scripture reveal of the Estate and Employments of the Blessed Dead and of the Risen Saints. By Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, M. A. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The author discusses his theme in an elevated and earnest strain, and with richness and beauty of style. The points presented are, that the state of the blessed dead is one of imperfection, of rest, of consciously living to God, of being with Christ, of Paradisiacal bliss, of mutual recognition and of holy fellowship, of victory and assurance of reward, and of earnest expectation; the state of risen saints is one of personal perfection of body and spirit, a state of eternal rest and refreshment, of reward, of combined royalty and service, of social perfection, of perfected communion with God in Christ, a state of perpetuity and yet of progression.

The Law of Love, and Love as a Law; or Moral Science, theoretical and practical. By Mark Hopkins, D. D. LL. D., President of Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The sub-

stance of this volume was delivered, as a course of Lectures before the *Lowell Institute*, and may be regarded as a sequel to the author's work on Moral Science, published several years ago. It is a thorough discussion of the theory and practice of morals. Rejecting all low and utilitarian views of morals, it advocates the higher law, in opposition to the selfish influences of mere expediency.

Noontide at Sychar, or the Story of Jacob's Well. A New Testament Chapter in Providence and Grace. By J. R. Macduff, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The author, so well known by his numerous devotional works, thinks that there is no single incident in the New Testament so graphic and pictorial, as that contained in the fourth chapter of John's Gospel, and from it he enlarges upon the meaning, sets forth its design, and expands its lessons.

Light and Truth: Or Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Gospels. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This is another of Dr. Bonar's excellent works, full of practical thought and gospel truth, connected with apt illustration and useful lessons, the production of an earnest mind, seeking to do good.

Religion and the Reign of Terror; or the Church during the French Revolution. Prepared from the French of M. Edmond De Pressensé. By Rev. John P. Lacroix, A. M. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. The work opens with an Introduction on the condition of the Church of France at the eve of the Revolution, and, in four books, discusses: (1) The Constituent Assembly; (2) The Legislative Assembly and the National Convention until the Proclamation of the Separation of Church and State; (3) The Period of the Separation of Church and State; (4) The Concordat. The eventful years from 1789 to 1802, the vicissitudes of religion, and its relations to the civil power in France, are here described from a Christian stand-point.

The Parables of our Lord, Explained and Applied. By Rev. Francis Bourdillon, M. A. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. This is a clear, practical work, intended, more especially, for the spiritual improvement of the reader, containing the results rather than the processes of the learned author's investigations.

The Garden of Sorrows; or the Ministry of Tears. By Rev. John Atkinson. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. This volume, consisting of nineteen contemplations, looks upon human sorrow from Gethsemane, in the light of Christian faith and revelation. It is an interesting contribution to our devotional literature, and the children of affliction will here find much to sustain and comfort them in their sorrow.

Views from Plymouth Rock. A Sketch of the Early History of the Plymouth Colony. By Z. A. Mudge. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Mr. Mudge, who has written much to instruct the young, presents, in a popular and attractive form, interesting narratives connected with the early history of our own country.

The Opium Habit, With Suggestion as to the Remedy. New York: Harper & Bros. This work has been prepared chiefly for the benefit of opium-eaters, the number of whose unfortunate victims in the United States alone, is estimated at not less than eighty or one hundred thousand. The character of the volume may be learned from the following contents: (1) A narrative of a successful attempt to abandon Opium; (2) De Quincey's Confessions; (3) Coleridge's Rem-

iniscences; (4) William Blair; (5) Opium and Alcohol compared; (6) Insanity and Suicide from an attempt to abandon Morphine; (7) A Morphine Habit Overcome; (8) Robert Hall, John Randolph, William Wilberforce; (9) What shall they do to be saved? (10) Outlines of the Opium Cure.

Pictorial History of the Civil War in the United States of America. By Benson J. Lossing. Vol. III. Hartford: T. Belknap. This volume completes the author's admirable History of the late War, furnishing a faithful record of the events that transpired from the Summer of 1863, till the termination of the conflict, in the Spring of 1865, and embracing an interesting sketch of Lee's invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania, and the Battle of Gettysburg. The work, illustrated by numerous engravings and maps, prepared with conscientious care, in an earnest, patriotic spirit, and written in a clear and animated style, is a valuable contribution to the historic records of our country.

History of Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1861—5: Prepared in Compliance with Acts of the Legislature. By Samuel P. Bates, LL. D. Vol. I. Harrisburg: B. Singerly. This is an octavo volume, well arranged, and illustrated by carefully prepared maps and diagrams. It is one of the most interesting and valuable books ever published under the authority of the Commonwealth, presenting, from the beginning, a faithful record, with all the material details, of the efforts of the Volunteers of Pennsylvania to crush the Rebellion. The history of every separate organization, through its entire career, is given. The time of death and the place of burial of those, who fell in battle, or died in the service, are incorporated in the work. Dr. Bates has performed, with skill and success, the difficult task assigned him.

Bethlehem. This is a beautiful Steel Engraving by Sartain, from a painting of Dobson, published by Bradley & Co., Philadelphia, who are rendering great service in giving the public so many attractive pictures, at so moderate a price. The influence of these works of art, in cultivating the taste and elevating the character, cannot but be salutary.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Prof. H. B. Hackett, D. D., with the co-operation of Ezra Abbot, A. M. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Part XIV. This No. brings the work down to the word *Kir of Moab*. Among the rival editions of this admirable Dictionary, a preference will be given to this, as it possesses all the original matter, with important additions by eminent scholars.

Woof and Proof. No. I. Luther's Catechism with Explanations. Part I. The Ten Commandments. By E. J. Koons, A. M., Professor in Muhlenberg College. Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store.

The Exegetical Punctuation of the New Testament. By Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia. Andover: W. F. Draper.

Petros. The Wonderful Building. A Sermon preached to the Convention of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in Pittsburgh, Pa., Nov. 12th, 1868. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store, 807 Vine Street.

Dirge. Composed and Dedicated to the Memory of Rev. H. L. Baugher, D. D., late President of Pennsylvania College. By F. A. Conradi, of the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. New York: Frederick Blume.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXVIII.

Article.	Page.
<p>I. DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. C. J. EHREHART, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	<p>161</p>
<p>II. TRUE FAITH: ITS NATURE AND EFFICACY,....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. N. VAN ALSTINE, Minden, N. Y.</p>	<p>194</p>
<p>III. THE MEANING OF THE WORD SELAH,.....</p>	<p>217</p>
<p>IV. THE GOOD ANGELS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. H. LOUIS BAUGHER, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	<p>221</p>
<p>V. HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR WORSHIP?.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>233</p>
<p>VI. LUTHERANISM BEFORE LUTHER,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. R. WEISER, Manchester, Md.</p>	<p>255</p>
<p>VII. THE KEYS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, O.</p>	<p>269</p>
<p>VIII. SERMONIZING,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. HENRY ZIEGLER, D. D., Selinsgrove, Pa.</p>	<p>290</p>
<p>IX. SPRAGUE'S ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN PULPIT,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. V. L. CONRAD, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	<p>304</p>
<p>X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....</p>	<p>309</p>

Dr. Lintner's Article on *Foreign Missions* we have read with much interest. It is well calculated to arouse the Church to greater activity in this important work. *The Life and Labors of Oberlin* is a valuable contribution. Dr. Seiss has a well considered article on *Church Worship*. Dr. Krauth has greatly enriched its pages by a paper on the Reformation. *The Lutheran Church in the United States* furnishes valuable statistical information. *The Doctrine of the Sabbath and Lord's Day* by Rev. H. E. Jacobs, is discussed from a Lutheran stand-point, with clearness and ability. The *Review* richly deserves the entire support of the Church. It is not only well conducted, but its pages are enriched by contributions from the highest intellects, of which our Church, or any other, can boast.—*Evangelical Lutheran, Charlotte, N. C.*

We believe we do not say too much when we assert that this number is the most valuable and interesting that has appeared for years. One thing particularly praiseworthy is, that the *Review* represents all parts of our Church, and does not suffer itself to be bound by any ecclesiastical party. We would be exceedingly sorry, if the *Quarterly* should be made inaccessible to the one, or the other, portion of our Church. It is to be regretted that a Journal of such solid worth, so general in its articles, so free in its discussions of great truths, that affect social, civil and religious life, is not better supported; yet to confine it to the General Synod, as is demanded in many quarters, would be its destruction.—*Kirchenfreund, Richmond, Ind.*

This able and learned *Quarterly* is now before us, and is worthy of its high reputation. It is a solid, independent and original number.—*American Lutheran, Selinsgrove, Pa.*

This number of the *Review* seems to us one of the best, that has been issued for a long time. The contents are varied, and some of the articles indicate a high degree of scholarship.—*Lutheran Standard, Columbus, O.*

The January number of the *Review* is one of universal interest and ability.—*Lutheran Observer, Philadelphia.*

The *Evangelical Review* for January is a number of unusual excellence. It treats of such subjects, as Missions, Biblical Criticism, Liturgies, and Church History, with singular ability. We commend it to the attention of inquiring minds.—*Lutheran and Missionary, Philadelphia.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* gives a list of articles not only quite sufficient in variety, but generally well written, and full of good, sound thought.—*Evangelist, New York.*

The *Evangelical Review*, for January, contains a variety of interesting articles.—*New York Observer.*

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXIX.

JULY, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

THE SACRAMENTAL PRÉSENCE.

By Rev. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill.

We have no other apology to offer for entering into the contest concerning the presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist, than our desire to contribute our mite in defense of what we conceive to be *truth*. While we claim this as our motive, we concede the same to those whose views we shall oppose. We have no intention of attempting a survey of the broad field over which this controversy has spread, but shall strive to confine ourselves to the points raised by Dr. Krauth, in his articles in the January and July numbers 1867, of the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*. Not because he, as an individual, has placed them on record; nor as the expressions of an individual opinion; nor because they are new; but for the reason that in the form there expressed, they directly concern the Lutheran Church in America. And another reason for selecting these articles and limiting ourselves to them, is, that by confining ourselves, as far as possible, to the words of a cotemporaneous leader in the ranks of that party, we may, if possible, avoid rendering ourselves obnoxious to

the charge of misrepresentation and misconception, in regard to their opinions.

If Dr. Krauth correctly sets forth (as we suppose he does,) the *present* status of this doctrine, in the ranks of its advocates, we admit that very much that has been said against it, has fallen wide of the mark.

In order to avoid circumlocution, we shall make use of Dr. Krauth's name in our article, as the representative of that part of the Lutheran Church in America, which advocates the doctrine of the "Sacramental Presence."

We claim this right, because it is an article of faith published to the world by that body to which the Dr. belongs, and of which he is a prominent member, that "Confessions * * must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, * * and those who subscribe them must, not only agree to use them in the same words, but use and understand those words in one and the same sense."

The Point in Dispute.

Dr. Krauth maintains that "the body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Lord's Supper." "That apart from all qualities in the recipient, the presence of Christ's humanity in the Lord's Supper, is a positive reality." Also, that this presence is, "after another mode, supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, and yet real." "A presence not ideal or feigned, but most true; not fleshy, but spiritual; not after the manner of this earth, but of the unseen world; not natural, but supernatural." While we maintain, "That there is no presence of the glorified human body of the Saviour, either substantial or influential, (local or illocal,) in the Eucharist; yet, that whilst the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body, by which we are reminded of his sufferings, there is a peculiar and special spiritual blessing bestowed by the divine Saviour on all worthy communicants."*

Hence, our dispute with Dr. Krauth, is as to the *fact* of the presence of our Lord's body in the Supper. It is the "essence" of the doctrine that divides us. He maintains it is present, we deny it. Thus far, we suppose, the Dr. will agree with us, in stating the difference between our positions. But when we descend to a definition or explanation of the terms used by the Confession in stating this

* See Dr. Schmucker's Pop. Theol. 252.

doctrine, the boundary lines of the territory between us no longer stand out so boldly and distinctly. When we ask them to give us a statement of what they understand by the terms "true body," "under the form of bread," "*in the Lord's Supper*," &c. ; or on our own part attempt to base an argument on these terms, according to their usual signification; divergence and confusion at once ensue. The one side claiming its views have been misunderstood; the other claiming it has followed the usual and correct meaning of the terms employed.

Without attempting to prove each statement here made, we will illustrate by one or two examples from the Dr's. articles.

First, in regard to the meaning of the term "true body." That in itself its presence is determinate. That it is not present by extension or locality, but after a manner wholly incomprehensible to us, but yet, "if there be degrees of reality, more real than the local." Thus, if we judge of *what* is present by the manner of presence, destroying every attribute that we are acquainted with, as belonging to the human body.

Second, in regard to "*in the Lord's Supper*," although claiming that the Lord's body is present and received *in the Lord's Supper*; yet denying that it has any local presence *in, with, or under the bread*. But that "the sphere of the reality of the sacramental mystery is not of this world."

In reference to the first, we find him drawing distinctions upon very slight differences.

In the July number, (p. 399,) he quotes the language of Dr. Gerhart, and comments on it as follows:

"Dr. Gerhart goes on to say, that the Lutheran Church holds that 'communicants, unbelievers as well as believers, partake of the human nature of Christ, with the mouth.' We have looked a little into Lutheran theology, and must confess that the expression 'partaking of the *human nature* of Christ with the mouth,' is one which we never met, and which is to us incomprehensible."*

Now what can Dr. Krauth intend by this language, unless it be to deny the correctness of Dr. Gerhart's statement? No other inference can be drawn from it. Nor does his waiver afterwards, and reference to the Lutheran

* The italics are Dr. Krauth's

Church, as a whole, in regard to the words "with the mouth," destroy the intended force of his objection in the language quoted. From his italics we infer the offensive words are "*human nature*," used in the connection Dr. Gerhart has placed them.

That Dr. Krauth would condescend to a criticism of the verbal arrangement of the sentence, with no other more serious objection lying behind it, we cannot believe. And his own words contradict this idea, for he says, the expression is to him incomprehensible. Hence, his objection is a substantial one, and one that concerns his own opinion. And, yet, there is not one single thought, or even shade of meaning conveyed in that sentence, as a whole, or in its parts, but what Dr. Krauth holds and advocates, unless he rejects the Formula of Concord. But, as we have nothing to do with Dr. Gerhart's defence, we shall only examine this position, so far as necessary to the object we have in view.

Before he gets through that section of his article, he admits the oral reception of the body of Christ. Moreover, the language of the Formula (which we must defend,) is explicit. "The other mode of partaking of the body of Christ is oral or sacramental, when in the Lord's Supper, *the true, essential body and blood* of Christ are received and *partaken of orally.*"

Between this and the expression used by Dr. Gerhart, to which Dr. Krauth so seriously objects, there is but one point at which a difference could even be claimed; and that is between "body and blood" and "*human nature*." Yet, in at least a dozen places in the articles, we have quoted, he uses the words "*human nature*" of Christ, or "*humanity*" of Christ, to designate that which is present in the Eucharist; and, also, as equivalent to body and blood. For instance, (on p. 425, July,) "But as the communion is not based upon something ideal, but upon a supernatural verity, upon a presence spiritual, heavenly and incomprehensible in its manner, yet most true, a presence of the *human nature* of Christ—as a mystery of this presence has its heart not in us, but in the Incarnate Mediator, we believe that alike to those who receive the Supper in faith, and to those who receive it in unbelief, the object sacramentally received is the same." Here he uses "*human nature* of Christ," to designate that which is sacramentally (which the Formula explains by orally) received at the Lord's Supper.

Again, (p. 427,) "Our theologians when they speak of a reception by the mouth, mean no more than this—that he that receives the bread and wine by the mouth naturally, thereby, as by an organ, *receives the humanity* of Christ, sacramentally and supernaturally."

The real difficulty here with Dr. Krauth, is to find a form of words that will convey what he understands by the "body of Christ." But we are inclined to think the origin of this difficulty lies in the doctrine itself.

These illustrations are sufficient to show that, as we descend to the sub-divisions of the subject, the points of divergence increase.

Before leaving this point, we desire to compare Dr. Krauth's explanation of this oral reception, with what Dr. Luther says on the same subject.

The former defines as follows: "When the Formula and our theologians speak of a reception by the mouth, they speak as we may of the reception of the Holy Spirit, in, with, and under the preached Word, by the ear." And quoting Gerhart, "This sacramental eating is said to be spiritual, because the body of Christ is not eaten naturally, and because the mode of eating, like the presence itself, is neither natural, carnal, physical, nor local, but supernatural, divine, mystical, heavenly and spiritual."

We acknowledge that we experience some difficulty in understanding what kind of eating, with the natural mouth, that can be, which is neither natural, carnal, physical nor local, but is supernatural, divine, mystical, heavenly and spiritual.

The Formula asserts that, "The proper meaning of said Augsburg Confession, cannot be drawn from any other man's writing, more accurately and certainly, than from the didactic and polemic writings of Dr. Luther." And, Dr. Krauth, as a member of the General Council declares, that "In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction, that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as *they set forth none other than its system of doctrine and articles of faith, are of necessity pure and scriptural.* Pre-eminent among such accordant, pure and scriptural statements of doctrine * * are these; the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the *Formula of Concord.*"

Let us then turn to Luther's writings and see what he says on the subject of the oral reception, and compare it with the explanation given by Dr. Krauth.

"So this text is now clear, that the body of Christ is broken, distributed, *and eaten at the table, like other bread*, though under the form of bread, or in the bread."*

"Hence the Euthusiasts have acted improperly, as well as the Glossary on the Ecclesiastical Law, where they censure Pope Nicolas for forcing Berenger to this Confession, namely: compelling him to say, that he ground and pressed with his teeth, the real body of Christ. Would to God, that all the Popes were constrained to speak in a manner so becoming a Christian, as this Pope constrained Berenger to speak. For, it is indeed, the design of God, that whoever takes and eats this bread, shall take and eat the real body of Christ, and not mere bread only, as Wickliff teaches; for this bread is the body of Christ, just as the dove was the Holy Ghost, and the flame the angel."

"Thus, also, it is correct to say, whenever any one takes the bread, that he takes the body of Christ; when he eats the bread, he eats the body; when he presses this bread with his teeth and tongue, that he presses the body of Christ with his teeth and tongue; and ever true will it remain, however, that no one beholds, handles, eats or masticates the body of Christ, in that visible manner, in which one eats or masticates other flesh."†

In these words Luther certainly advocates a real and substantial oral reception of the Lord's body in the Eucharist. It is true, he does not hold, that it is in the visible manner in which other flesh is masticated; yet, it is a true eating in that sense, in which it is correct to say the teeth and tongue press the body of Christ. The reader can compare this explanation with that of Dr. Krauth's, and draw his own conclusion in regard to their agreement with each other.

The Arguments used to Maintain the Doctrine.

Beginning with the omnipresence of the Divine nature—which must be admitted—he assumes that the undivided totality of the Divine substance, is in each part of the universe at the same time. That there is no more of God in

* Diss. on the Lord's Supper, Sec. 434.

† Ib. 347—8.

the whole universe, than in each point of it; and, yet, without motion, extension or multiplication of presences. Then, taking it as granted, that this infinite Spirit has taken to itself a human nature as an inseparable element of its person, he claims as an inevitable result, that where the divine is, the human must be. That as the lowest element of a personal union is the co-presence of the parts; therefore, if there is a place where the human nature of Christ is not united with the second person of the Trinity, then there is a place where the second person is not incarnate; and if not incarnate in one place, then in none. Then as the Divine nature is admitted to be present in the Lord's Supper, it must follow, as an inevitable conclusion, that the Lord's human nature is there also.

If each step of this process of reasoning, except the last, were established, we would be compelled to admit that it would necessarily follow.

Our Exceptions to this Reasoning.

Our first objection is to basing an argument on the assumption of that which he confesses lies within the region of incomprehensibility. I say "assumption," for to assert that the *undivided totality* of the *substance* of God, is in each part of the universe; *all* in heaven, and *all* on earth, all on earth without ceasing in any measure to be all in heaven; without motion, extension, expansion, division or multiplication of presences, is an assumption. It is assuming that which is not known, not demonstrated, or susceptible of demonstration. Though many theologians assent to it, and their opinions are worthy of regard, yet it is but assumed. Is God omnipresent? Certainly he is. I believe this as firmly as Dr. Krauth, or any one else. And while I believe the human mind may grasp the single idea of omnipresence in a *qualitative* sense, yet I believe with him, that the *how* is an "inscrutable mystery." But he in one breath says, it is an "inscrutable mystery," "utterly incomprehensible to us," and in the next, tells us, it is all in heaven and all on earth at the same time, without motion, extension, expansion, division or multiplication of presences. If it is *utterly* incomprehensible, how does he know it is not by emanation, diffusion, or expansion? How does he know there is as much of God in one place as another? How does he comprehend it sufficiently to know that it is without motion, extension or multipresence?

Where has Revelation asserted this fact? Had it done so, then the *how* would not have been utterly incomprehensible. These are negative definitions; hence, Dr. Krauth's expression is too broad, or his definitions and limitations are gratuitous. Yet there are foundation stones, on which to build a "fundamental doctrine."

Our second exception is to his asking it to be granted "that this infinite Spirit, (the divine Logos,) has taken to itself a human nature, as an inseparable element of *its own* person;" and, at the same time, denying that this humanity "is confounded with the divinity." Had he asked, that it be granted, that by the incarnation, the human nature had become a real and necessary element or constituent of the "Unio,"—the person, Christ—we would have no controversy with him here. But to assert that the Logos has taken to itself a human nature, to be an inseparable element and constituent of *its own* person, appears, to our mind, so much like the blending of the natures, or absorption of the human by the divine, that we cannot accept it.

Our third exception is, that while the Dr. claims that the divine nature has a presence without extension, expansion or locality; and that it renders the human nature present, also, without extension, expansion or locality; yet he assumes this locality in the chief step of his reasoning. For his argument is, "If there be a *place* where the human nature of Christ is not united with the second person of the Trinity, then there is a place where the second person of the Trinity is not incarnate. If this is granted, then the whole second person of the Trinity is unincarnate." If locality has nothing to do with this mode of presence, how can the Dr. base an argument upon the relation the union of the natures bears to a given place? Grant what he claims, and it at once proves a local presence, a presence within a given boundary. Thus, I select a given place, (and place must have locality) and assert the Lord's human nature is not present there: Dr. Krauth asserts it is, for the reason quoted—I then admit it is. What have I admitted? That the human nature of Christ is present in a given space. How then will he free this from the idea of locality, unless he attaches a peculiar and unusual meaning to the term "locality." If he does this, the effect of his answer to the charge of the opposition is destroyed, in regard to local presence. A presence at all points without extension, mo-

tion, multiplication or locality, is something entirely beyond the grasp of the human mind; and as Dr. Krauth, himself, places it there, he should not attempt to build an argument on that, which contradicts his own position.

Again, if I assert that the divinity only is in a given place, he will deny it. Why? Can it be for any other reason, than that there comes before his mind the idea of a contradiction of the presence of one nature to a less extent than the other? If this is not the force of his argument, where does it lie? Separate wholly from the argument the idea of extension and locality, and does it prove anything? This, then, is assuming, as a basis for his reasoning, that which he has denied. If this link of his argument is broken, the whole doctrine, so far as his process of reasoning is concerned, falls to the ground.

Our Objections to the Doctrine, as exhibited in Dr. Krauth's Articles.

Our first objection, is the constant danger its advocates are in, of falling into Monophysitism, by the side of which their doctrine runs so closely, that it is extremely difficult to distinguish the separating line.

As has been before intimated, the force of their principal arguments seems to depend upon the idea of a commingling of essences in the "Unio," or the absorption of the human by the divine. Although this is expressly denied, yet the language they use, leans strongly in that direction, as will be seen from the language of Dr. Krauth, we have already quoted. And the repeated efforts of the Formula, and the advocates of the Sacramental Presence, to disengage themselves from this idea of a commixture of essences, indicates that they feel their near approach to it, and the extreme tenuity of the line separating them from it. And in this struggle to keep themselves from sliding into Monophysitism, they run into other difficulties equally serious.

While they hold a communication of attributes, they reject the idea of a communication of the essences. Hence, if through the "*Unio personalis*," divine attributes are communicated, and yet no communication of essence takes place, the attributes will be severed from the divine essence, which is inconsistent with the divine nature. The Dr. asserts, that whatever the divine has, the human has through

the divine. The formula seems to waver between the two positions, now leaning toward the one, now toward the other. As Dorner has truly remarked :* “Assiling Monophysitism in a tone implying that the *communicatio idiomatum* was not deemed to involve a communication of the essential elements of the two natures, or their substance : whilst, on the other hand, when the object is to show how much the *communicatio idiomatum* does for the unity, the Formula warns us against supposing that the essential features of the two natures remain foreign to each other, and incommunicable.”

Another result of this doctrine, as set forth by the Dr. is, that notwithstanding the *communicatio idiomatum*, the humanity appears to have gained nothing by the union. For of itself its presence is local and determinate, and its claimed omnipresence is only the act of the divine nature, the human remaining passive. Consequently, the humanity is still, “no more than the organ of a special revelation of Deity.” “For, unless, the *persona* of the Logos becomes the property of the human nature, and if the person of the Word merely has, and bears a concrete human nature, then humanity is a mere *organon*, and all that deity has attained is a theophany.” A passive omnipresence, does not elevate the idea of the incarnation, or indicate any reception on the part of the human nature ; it leaves the *persona* with the Logos ; and the humanity but an inactive appendage, so far as omnipresence is concerned.

Another objection that we would urge to the doctrine of the presence, as stated by Dr. Krauth, is that it is not compatible with the nature and attributes of Christ.

The divine nature of Christ possesses all the attributes of divinity, including, as a matter of course, omnipresence and omniscience. And, that these attributes are necessary and essential elements of the divine nature, not separable from the divine essence, will be admitted. The Dr's own language clearly implies this, notwithstanding the difficulty his doctrine has to contend with, on this point, before alluded to. We cannot be required to harmonize the incompatibles in their system.

“The divine attributes are not to be regarded as an external possession ; they are all essential, for in God there is nothing accidental ; nay, more, they constitute the es-

* Per. Ch. II. 2. 217.

sence of God, and in their unity are simply the living God himself, who is to be conceived as *actus purissimus*."

"The prevailing opinion, therefore, that the Lutheran doctrine of the *Communicatio idiomatum* is connected with the notion of the separability of the divine attributes from the divine essence, is erroneous. But, in that case, the communication of the divine essence, must also be taught."*

If, then, by virtue of the "*Unio personalis*" omnipresence is communicated to the humanity, through the divinity; its omnipresence, of necessity, becomes an essential element of his being. In fact, this is one of the pillars on which the Dr. builds. "Where the divine is, the human *must be*." "An *inseparable element*," of the infinite Spirit. And, here he is with Luther. If omnipresence is an essential element of divine existence, it is not then a consequence of will, or divine potency, but a necessity. Hence, it follows, that the omnipresence of the body, (be the mode what it may,) is, also, a divine necessity, not a product of the will. Therefore, the qualifying clause, "Where Christ will," not only loses its force, but stands in opposition to the *Communicatio idiomatum*.

This difficulty was seen and felt not long after the publication of the *Formula Concordiae*. In 1589, the Suabians published a work against the Helmstädter theologians, in which they "seek to show that the old doctrine of Brentz, is the genuine meaning of the Formula; by explaining the concession contained in it to Chemnitz—*quando et quomodo voluerit*—not as antagonistic to the absolute omnipresence of the humanity, but as referring solely to the *modus* thereof."†

According to the premises laid down by Dr. Krauth—that where the divine is, the human must be—if Christ wills that his human nature shall not be present at a given point, this withdraws the divine presence from that point, and He ceases to be omnipresent; which contradicts the Dr's own position. It would, also, imply a voluntary limitation of divine omniscience, which involves a contradiction. And to will that the human nature should not be at a given place, according to the Dr's reasoning, would render the Logos unincarnate at that place, and consequently wholly unincarnate. What, then, is the force of

* Dorn. II. 2 : 233.

† Dorn. Per. Ch. D 2. V 2. 269.

the expression, "Where Christ will?" That he has power to manifest Himself at one time and place, in a manner different from that in which his divine nature is ordinarily omnipresent, we are willing to admit. But when this is claimed for any given time or place, (for manifestations to humanity must have time and place,) the *fact* must be established, before an argument can be built on it, worthy of consideration.

Granting the power of our Lord to render His body present in the Eucharist, in each of Luther's modes, does not prove that He does render it present in either of them. Hence, divine potency, is an unnecessary factor in the argument. Nor is the doctrine of the presence, as argued by Dr. Krauth, based upon special manifestations, but upon a law arising out of the "*Unio hypostatica*." All the arguments adduced for it, proceed on this hypothesis.

The "Another mode," rendered so emphatic in Dr. Krauth's Article, (January,) is not there claimed to be, or spoken of, as a special manifestation: but is simply placed in contrast with that mode in which our Lord's body is said to be present, "after its own intrinsic manner," "determinate," and not on earth." And it is to the proof of this position that the Dr. has directed his arguments.

And the result at which he claims he arrives is, that where the divine is, the human must be; hence, as a necessary consequence the Lord's Supper.

But, if this is so, why give this presence the name of "Sacramental presence?" It is a misnomer, for it is, according to their own method of demonstration, in no peculiar sense a Sacramental presence. Let it be remembered, that the argument presented to establish the position is, that the lowest element of personal union is the co-presence of the parts, hence, as the divine is omnipresent, the human must, also, be omnipresent through the divine; wherever the latter is, the former must also be. Luther says, "Everything is full through and through of Christ, even according to his humanity." "Externally to this man, there is no God." As this is the argument to prove the presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist, if it establishes this, it establishes more: that it is a law of his being, resulting from his hypostatical union; and not a presence peculiar to the Eucharist. Therefore, the name Sacramental presence, is a misnomer, and, unless guarded, conveys (if any,) a wrong meaning.

And, if their arguments prove anything, they prove a general law, that makes the body of Christ present at all times and places, wheresoever his divinity is. And, as this is *all* present, at all times in all places, so, likewise, the "whole Christ," (human and divine,) must be present at all times in all places, (*non abstante* the "*quando et quomodo voluerit.*") Everything must be, as Luther says, full through and through of Him, even according to his humanity. Therefore, when at tea, having given thanks, we take bread, break and eat it, we are as truly and really eating the broken body of our Lord, as when at the Eucharist. For faith they claim, is not a necessary factor.

It is true, the answer may be returned: "You believe in the spiritual presence in the Eucharist? You believe that Christ is also spiritually omnipresent, hence, in everything, at all times? Is not your usual meal, then, to you as much a sacrament as the Eucharist?"

The cases might be considered parallel, if we looked to the presence itself, as the peculiar blessing received at the Lord's Supper. And, if the pertinency of the answer should be admitted, it would apply as much to them, as others. But, in addition to this, they also believe in the presence of the natural body of Christ, and to this, they look as the great and peculiar blessing of this Sacrament.

"Now there are two modes of partaking of the flesh of Christ; the one is spiritual * * and this spiritual eating is useful and salutary. * * But this spiritual eating is nothing else but faith. * *. The other mode is oral or sacramental, when in the Lord's Supper, the true, essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken orally, by all who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, in this holy sacrament. Believers receive the body and blood of Christ as a *sure pledge and confirmation that their sins are certainly remitted, and that Christ dwells and is efficacious in them.*"*

The parts of this last sentence may be consistent with each other, yet, as a whole, it has a strange ring about it. That believers who have Christ dwelling in them, should eat his body orally, as a proof and pledge of this fact, has a singular sound.

Luther says,† "But our wise spirits, who cry out vociferously, 'How can bread and wine forgive sins or strength-

* Form. Con. See Bk. Con. 673.

† Lar. Cat. 534.

en faith, pervert our meaning with their strange erudition and wisdom, when, at the same time, they hear and know that we do not say this of bread and wine—as bread in itself is bread—but of such bread and wine, as are the body and blood of Christ, and *such as are connected with the words; this, and no other*, I say, is the treasure, indeed, through which *this forgiveness of sins is obtained.*”

Therefore, while we hold that the inference, we have drawn above, is applicable to those advocating this doctrine; on the other hand, we maintain that it will not apply with equal force to those rejecting it. Hear the Dr's own words: “On any other theory, the Christian on earth, has no more a personal Christ with him, than the Patriarchs had; the New Dispensation, has made no advance on the Old; the divine nature, the second person of the Trinity, was just as much on earth then, as now; and all the light, peace and joy, which a sense of the actual nearness, tender guardianship, and personal sympathy of an incarnate Christ, sheds upon the soul, vanish in a haze of hyperboles, a miserable twilight of figures of speech, *and the vigorous and soul-sustaining objectivity of Faith, faints into a mere sentimentality.*” Yes, faith, “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,” must faint and sink, if it does not have the body of the Master present, that it may thrust its hands into his side. The germinal idea of this expression, strikes at the very heart of personal religion. For, it seems at least, to imply that our Lord, through his spiritual presence cannot, or does not impart to the Christian's heart, that light, peace and joy which flows from pardoning love. That without the bodily presence, all the peace and joy the Christian believes he feels, is “mere sentimentality.” Faith, which sinks and faints in its efforts to follow its Lord from the Cross, to the throne, can feed bountifully on a mysterious and incomprehensible presence. “Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.”

While we believe, and claim that Christ is present in the Eucharist, in what may be properly termed a peculiar manner, yet that peculiarity has no reference to the spiritual essence, or mode of omnipresence or presence, but to that which is imparted to the believer's heart, by the ever present entity. And the following language of Dr. Schaff, we present, as embodying the true idea on this point. “The Lord's Supper, is the solemn festival for the thank-

ful commemoration of the atoning death of Jesus, for the believing appropriation and sealing of the fruits of this death, and for renewing and strengthening the vital union of believers with the ever-living, divine-human Redeemer, as well as with one another. It is thus the sacrament of the *unio mystica*, and of the *communio sanctorum* resting upon it. In it, is the deepest mystery of our faith, as it were continually embodied. In it, the Church with thanksgiving and prayer celebrates and enjoys the highest and closest union, she can ever enjoy on earth, with her heavenly Head, who, though sitting at the right hand of God, and thus partaking of His almighty and omnipresent power, is still, and in fact, for this very reason, invisibly, and yet truly present with her in the Spirit."*

Another objection to the doctrine of the bodily presence, is that it brings forward the body of Christ to the obscuring, and, I might say, virtual ignoring of his human soul. Of course, its advocates do not deny the Saviour a human soul. This we do not charge. But, that in their system, it becomes to them, a troublesome factor; hence, in order to avoid confusion, it is left as much as possible out of view. It is a significant fact, that in discussing this doctrine, its advocates seem to forget even the existence of our Lord's human soul.†

It is true, the discussion relates to the bodily presence, yet when this, as it is in their system, is based on the nature of the "*Unio hypostatica*," scarcely a step can be taken, until the soul becomes involved. And, when Luther tells us, that we can point to the consecrated bread, and say truly, that is the body of Christ, and to the wine, and say, that is his blood, the question involuntarily arises, where is His soul? When we are told by the Formula, that the real body is broken, distributed and eaten orally, again, the question comes up, where is His soul?

* Hist. Apos. Ch. 582.

† For proof of this assertion, I refer the reader to Luther's long Diss. on the Lord's Supper. To Art. VIII. Epitome, and VIII. of Decl. Form. Con. Also, Dorn, P. C. II. 2. Note 28, p. 415. Where he says, speaking of the Christology of Brentz and Andreae, "But we see from this how, so long as attention was so predominantly directed to the body of Christ, almost without even a thought being given to His soul, they robbed themselves of an important link."

While, through the divinity, the body is rendered omnipresent, is the soul confined to that determinate body, or does it participate in the omnipresence?

Even when they use the term, "humanity," "human nature," &c., in this connection, they generally stand as equivalent to body. Take, for instance, the list of attributes ascribed to Christ's human nature, in the Formula of Concord.

"The attributes of the human nature, are these; to be a corporeal creature, to consist of flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend, to descend, to move from place to place, to hunger, to thirst, to experience cold, heat, or similar things."*

Here is a list of the attributes of the human nature, given, with reference to the *communicatio idiomatum*, and yet the chief element, or part of the nature described, is omitted. The very center of the humanity seems, by this doctrine, pushed aside. And, again, we are forced to ask, what is their view of the incarnation? What do they mean by "real incarnation?" Is the human soul the center point of the union? Do they recognize a human *Ego*? Which, although most intimately united with the Logos, and, therewith, forming one person, yet does not lose its identity? By their system, it appears to be either pressed into the physical nature, and made an absolute element of it, or wholly swallowed up by, and lost in the divinity.

Another objection, to this doctrine of the presence, as presented by Dr. Krauth's article, is this: That as according to it, the whole divinity, hence, the "whole Christ," is at and in each and every point of the universe at the same time, throughout and in all things, in heaven and in earth, in another and higher mode than the local and determinate presence; it presents this strange anomaly; that the body of Christ, through the divinity, is present *in* the determinate body. Not only so, but that the whole Christ is present, in each and every part of that determinate body. And this results in supposing a double Christ—as to His humanity—the one capable of penetrating the other. Otherwise, the divinity in the determinate body ceases to have the same power it has out of it. I am aware, such deductions will be repelled, as con-

* Bk. Concord, p. 576. Henkel 2d Ed. 1854.

trary to their belief; but the proper question to be decided is, are they legitimate?

Notwithstanding the Dr. is such a strong advocate, for each article and word of the Augsburg Confession, we hold, that this doctrine of the presence, as stated and argued by him, does not accord with it, but stands opposed to it.

The Tenth Article of the *Unaltered* Confession reads as follows:

"Concerning the holy Supper of the Lord, it is taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, *under the form of bread and wine*, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. The opposite doctrine is, therefore, rejected."*

In this article there are two statements in regard to the presence of the body of our Saviour in the Eucharist; first, that it is truly present; second, that it is present "under the form of bread and wine;" or limiting it strictly to the body "under the form of bread." Our proposition in regard to disagreement, relates to the latter statement. We suppose it will be conceded, that "under the form," (*unter der Gestalt*,) has no reference to position. Hence, it must have reference to the mode of presence.†

In order that we may arrive at the true meaning of these words, let us turn to Luther's writings, which, we have already seen the Formula says, set forth more correctly than any other man's writings, the sense and meaning of the Confession.

He tells us, "I maintain, with Wickliff, that bread remains there; on the other hand, I maintain with the Sophists, that the body of Christ is present; and, thus, in defiance of reason, and the most acute logic, that it is very possible for *two distinct substances to be*, and to be called

* This translation is taken from the Book of Concord, published by S. D. Henkel & Bros. 2nd Ed. 1824. The translation of the Augsburg Confession, for this edition, having been revised by C. P. Krauth, D. D., Prof. Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

† We make no reference to the variation of copies of the Confession. We take that which has been accepted by those whose views we oppose, as the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession."

one essence."* For, although body and bread are two distinct substances, each one independent in itself, and where they are considered separately, certainly neither can be taken for the other, yet when they are combined, *and become one entire substance*, they then lose their distinctive characters, so far as they constitute *one distinct object*, and as they *actually become, and are but one thing*. Thus, the object is then called and spoken of as one definite object, so that there is no necessity for one of its constituent parts to disappear and yield, but both bread and body remain, and it is properly said, in consequence of the sacramental union, 'This is my body,' *designating the bread by the little word this*. For it is now no longer mere bread from the oven, but flesh-and-bread, (*fleisches Brod*,) or body-and-bread, (*Leibs Brod*,) that is, a bread that has become identical—one sacramental substance—with the body of Christ."†

This language of Luther, is certainly too plain to be misunderstood. It gives the words of the Confession their full and natural force and meaning. The body of the Lord is truly present, *in or under the form of the bread*. The bread and body without losing their natural qualities, become one. So that when we point to the bread, we can truly say, that is the body of Christ. Not that the empty circumambient air is the body also; but that the bread in its length and breadth is the body of Christ. And, hence, it is present under the *form of the bread*.

Turn to the Formula, (p. 667,) and there we find the same interpretation. "And Dr. Luther, who certainly understood the true and proper meaning of the Augsburg Confession, rather than others, and constantly adhered to it, and defended it, till the end of his life, in his last Confession, a little before his death, confessed his faith concerning this Article, with great zeal, and repeated it in the following words, where he thus writes: 'I reckon all those in the same number, that is, as sacramentarians and fanatics—for such they are—who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Supper, *is his true natural body*, which the ungodly, or Judas, as well as Peter and all other saints, *receive orally*; whoever, I say, will not believe this, should let me alone, and not expect to hold fellowship with me; and to this principle I must adhere.' From this exposition, but more especially from Dr. Luther's explanation,

* Diss. L. S. Sec. 337.

† Sec. 355.

who is the principle divine of the Augsburg Confession, every intelligent person, who loves truth and peace, can perceive with certainty, what has always been the proper meaning and sense of the Augsburg Confession, concerning this article."

This is the interpretation of Article X, the Dr. and all those holding with him, have bound themselves to. These words are plain and emphatic, and seem to have been written by Luther as a last determined expression of his view on this point, that it might not be frittered away by mysterious explanations. We admit that Luther also wrote and argued in regard to the incomprehensible mode of presence, but these are the words the Formula has selected as the true exposition of this doctrine.*

Now, we ask any Lutheran to place Dr. Krauth's statement of this doctrine by the side of the tenth Article of the Confession, as thus explained by Luther, and see if he can say they agree with each other.

How can the natural body of Christ be present under the *form* of bread, broken by the minister, distributed to the communicants, and eaten by them; and yet the natural body not present in a determinate sense, but the only presence in a mode that is supernatural, *illocal, incomprehensible*, yet real, through its union with the divinity? And eaten not * * naturally, carnally, physically or locally, but supernaturally, mystically, heavenly, spiritually.

Perhaps a way of escape may be sought in the distinction that may be made between "presence" and "mode of presence" between "mode" and "form." We will not here stop to argue this matter, we know there is a distinction to be made between the terms, but in their present use, we defy the Dr. or any one else, to define a mode of presence applicable to the point, without describing the presence itself. In this case, the one involves the other. And the word "form" in the Confession, is used precisely in the same sense he uses mode, otherwise, one or the other is meaningless.

Let us place the Dr's language, the Confession and Luther side by side, and see the contrast.

Dr. Krauth; "That after *another mode*, (not in virtue of

* These extracts from Luther, were inserted in the Formula through the influence of the Suabians, who thus obtained the establishing of their stronger view, against the milder view of Chemnitz. Dorner, P. Ch. D. II. Vol. 2 : p. 215.

its own essential qualities, not a *determinate presence*;) supernatural, *illocal*, *incomprehensible*, and yet real, it is rendered present 'where Christ will,' through the divine nature. The Confession; "The true body and blood are truly present, *under the form of bread and wine*." Luther; "His *true natural body* by the ungodly and saints is received orally. * * Though the body and bread are two distinct substances, * * they are combined, and become one entire substance. * * Both body and bread remain, and it is properly said, in consequence of the sacramental union; 'This is my body,' *designating the bread*. * * Bread which has become identical, one sacramental substance, *with the body of Christ*."

Again, I ask, is there perfect harmony between these? Nay, more, does not the first stand in direct opposition to the second, as explained by the third? The attempt to take shelter under the broad mantle of incomprehensibility, looks very much like a conceded inability to defend the doctrine advocated.

The Dr. says, "The Lord's body has no determinate, natural, local or comprehensible presence, or mode of presence on earth." The Confession replies, "It is in the form of bread;" and Luther adds, "Yes, that bread is the body, and the natural body too." And both, (Luther and the Confession,) join in exclaiming, "When the minister breaks the bread, and distributes to Christian and sinner, he breaks the true natural body, and with his hands presents it to the communicants." The Dr's theory says, "Nay, the bread is broken, but the whole Christ is in each fragment, and all around it, for there is as much of Christ at one point as another."

Nor are other advocates any nearer in harmony with each other. Let us compare a few, chiefly selecting the Dr's quotations.

One says, "We neither believe in *Impanation* or *Consubstantiation*." The Confession says, "Under the form of bread." Another says, "But in neither sense can that monstrous doctrine of consubstantiation be attributed to our Church, since Lutherans do not believe either in that local conjunction of two bodies, *nor in any commingling of bread and of Christ's body*, of wine and of his blood." Luther contends that, "They are combined, *and become one entire substance*." The Dr. denies that the doctrine of ubiquity is taught. The Formula condemns the doctrine,

"That God with all His omnipotence, is not able to provide that the body of Christ shall not be essentially, or substantially, at one time, in more than one place." Another asserts, "Nor do we believe in that consubstantiative presence, which some define to be the inclusion of one substance in another." The Formula condemns the idea, "That believers should not seek the body of Christ in the bread and wine of the holy Supper."

They abhor the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, yet teach that "On account of their sacramental union, the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ."

They admit,* "There is one mode of partaking of the flesh of Christ, which is spiritual, and that this spiritual eating is nothing else but faith." But add that "there is another mode which is oral or sacramental when in the Lord's Supper, the true essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken of orally."

Yet, in explanation, they say that this mode though not spiritual, is "supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, being rendered present through the divine nature."

Can any one tell us whereabouts, between the spiritual presence and transubstantiation, a spot is left for their doctrine to rest its foot upon?

Well may the question be asked, in good faith, what is their belief on this point? And the Dr. fearing, perhaps, that some "evangelical Lutheran," may get lost amid this theological maze, and be unable to give an intelligent answer to the question, "How can Christ's human nature be present with us," puts this answer into his mouth. "He can reply, after the manner in which an infinite spirit renders present a human nature, which it has taken to be an inseparable constituent of its own person, a manner most real, but utterly incomprehensible to us." It is exactly as it is. And yet this is the answer to be given in regard to a "fundamental doctrine."

Last, though not least, we ask, is the doctrine as thus set forth by the Dr. and others, drawn from the words of the Saviour, at the institution of the Lord's Supper?

As the argument on this point, has already been so ably presented in the *Review*, in the Article of Prof. Sternberg, we will not attempt to go over the same ground again; but will content ourself with simply bringing the Scrip-

tural narrative, and Dr. Krauth's statement of this doctrine together.

"It was evening, the appointed hour at which our Lord desired to eat the passover, when he set down with the twelve apostles. And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples and said, Take eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "This do in remembrance of me."

Here is a plain, unembellished narrative, which, so far as the statement of the transaction is concerned, cannot be simplified. While they are at table, Jesus takes some of the bread before them, and of which they had been eating, and solemnly blesses it, or gives thanks in reference to it, then breaks it, and presents it to His disciples, saying, as he hands it to them, "Take eat; this is my body."

Doubtless, a deep and unusual solemnity fell upon that little group. Nor are we unfurling too freely the wings of our imagination, when we say, that an expression of holy sadness, perhaps, then began to show itself, on the beloved countenance of their Lord, who felt the approach of that mighty contest, which He had to undergo. And, it is more than probable, that the disciples were expecting some great event to happen, and were prepared in part, for strange occurrences.

Be this as it may, the startling announcement, that one of them should betray him; and that He would not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until He should drink it anew with them in his Father's kingdom; must have filled their souls with the deepest solemnity, and fixed indelibly upon their hearts and memory every word and act of their beloved Master.

And, when he lay buried in the tomb, doubtless, the words, "This do in remembrance of me," brought back to memory, every act and expression of that solemn occasion, with life-like vividness. Yea, after their gloom had been dispelled by their risen Lord; after He had given his last charge, and had ascended to his Father, these words at each communion feast, placed them again in memory, with Christ at that solemn feast, but now, the sad cloud that then hung over them, was removed. And as they broke bread and handed to their disciples, saying,

"Take eat; this is my body," repeating their Lord's words; how clearly would memory show to them the broken bread in their Saviour's hands, its form, its very shadings were faithfully preserved; but, more than all, the words, the tones, the voice, the countenance, the melting love of Him who held it.

What then did they, Peter, James and John, and the other disciples who were present, understand by these important words. When Jesus handed them the broken bread, which he held in his hand, saying, "Take eat; this is my body," how did they understand it.

Let Dr. Krauth answer, for we presume he claims that he gives the same interpretation upon these words, that Peter, James and John did; and that he understands them in the same sense they did. Therefore, we will present his doctrine, and the doctrine of the Formula, as an answer to the question. It runs, in substance, thus: That when the Lord said, "This is my body," he meant that the bread which he designated by the little word *this*, was really and truly his natural body. But he did not mean that his body (which they saw before them,) had been changed into the bread which he held in his hand; nor that this bread which had been lying on the table in view, had been suddenly changed into his body. Nor did he mean that his body had been mingled in a local manner, with the bread; or that it was locally shut up in it. He did not mean that, in a spiritual sense, or spiritual manner, this was his body, or that he was only spiritually present in it. He did not mean that "this bread represents my broken body." He did not wish his disciples to understand these words in a figurative sense. But he did intend them to understand, that although they saw his local and determinate body before them, yet, that through his divine nature, his body "after another mode, supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, and yet real, was rendered present" in the bread. That when he said to them, as he handed them the bread, "This is my body," such was his meaning. Did Peter so understand the words of his beloved Master? Did John who leaned upon his Lord, rest his hope of blessing and comfort on such a metaphysical process of reasoning as this? Would the eminently practical James, if he rejected the idea of any figure, have been satisfied with such an intangible, incomprehensible bodily presence as this? And how with doubting Thomas? Had he under-

stood his Master, that his words were in no sense figurative, would he not have said, Show us Lord, how can this be?

We make no further comments on this comparison. Can such a mystical doctrine as this, be legitimately drawn from our Saviour's words? Is it not rather founded on the idea they hold of the nature of the hypostatical union? And would it not be, so far as their process of reasoning is concerned, just as true without the Saviour's words instituting his Supper, as with them?

The truth is, as we understand it, that between *transubstantiation* and the *symbolic representation*, there can come no consistent doctrine. There is not a foot-hold between these two, but what is slippery ground, and surrounded by fogs and mists. Hear the worthy Mosheim, who feels himself afloat, without a land-mark to guide him: "What the nature of this presence is, we do not know. The thing itself we know; but the mode of its truth is a mystery which we cannot comprehend. Should any one ask, How is he present? our answer is, We know not."

If we cut loose from our anchorage, in the symbolic view, we are tending toward the hard shores of transubstantiation. Luther attempted, and did break loose from the latter, and, although he did not reach the point which we think the true one, yet we must ever admire and cherish a love for that bold and noble champion and leader of the great Reformation, as we behold him tearing loose, one after another, of the superstitious bonds that bound the Bride of Jesus. He plants his feet upon the Word as the only sure foundation, and he clings closely to the letter, lest, through interpretation, danger may ensue. And boldly and nobly does he wield the lance against every one who refuses to stand by his side. See him, at Marburg; although we differ from Luther, as to his view on this point, and lean in opinion, somewhat toward the position of Œcolampadius and Zwingli, though by no means, wholly embracing it; yet, as we imagine him standing beneath the arches of King's Hall, pointing to the words before him, and hear his firm voice ring out, "*Hoc est corpus meum*," I believe that his body is really there," we can but admire him. This same firm spirit shook the seat of Popedom. And we acknowledge that we agree with Dr. Krauth, when in speaking of Luther, he says, "Surely, that is a

glorious error, if error it be, which springs from trusting too far, too implicitly, in too child-like a way, in the simple words of our adorable Lord." Yet Luther was but a man, and we wonder that so few shreds of the bonds, that bound him, yet clung to him. He was the chosen vessel in the hands of God, to perform a mighty work; and nobly did he do the duty assigned him.

Before closing, we may add, that some of the leading Lutheran divines of Europe, who once held with Dr. Krauth's view, are conceding the symbolic explanation of our Saviour's words; as Martensen, Kahnis, &c.

The general tendency is evidently in this direction; therefore, we may fairly conclude, that the movement in our own country, in the opposite direction, is but spasmodical, a mere reaction of the wave, that is driven before the deep substratum moving beneath.

ARTICLE II.

THE KEYS.*

By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, Ohio.

In our former article on this subject, we traced the views that were entertained, respecting Math. 16: 18, 19, by the early Fathers of the Church, Pope Gelasius and his successors, and the Reformers. The details given, and the history referred to, indicated that the interpretation of this passage moulded, in a remarkable manner, the destiny of the Church, and of the world.

The Reformation, by fully restoring and reaffirming the expositions of the Fathers, diminished the practical working of those Keys. The Popes, feeling them to be too ponderous for their hands, and realizing that their weight was causing them to slip from their grasp, promised, in order to retain them, reformation, and then resorted to political artifice and intrigue, to secure the warlike co-op-

* Concluded from p. 269.

eration of kings and nations. Those arts were only too successful, not indeed, in causing the power of the Keys to be perfectly restored, or even to influence the disenfranchised to again submit to the yoke, but in plunging nations into the most bitter and long-continued wars, and in shedding the blood of a vast multitude. For, it is a singular result of the Reformation, that whilst the Roman See has never recalled the Gelasian and Hildebrandic interpretation of the passage under review, it has been unable, down to the present day, to enforce it on Roman Catholic nations. Whilst the latter are willing to accept it in part, yet kings and statesmen, enlightened by the past, are unwilling to save themselves and their privileges, to acknowledge that primacy and supremacy in the sense once universally believed. They, in point of fact, now stand where Luther stood when he contested with Dr. Eck. The Popes, seeing that it would be impolitic, do not press the subject of supremacy in temporal matters, and are willing to avoid agitation and damaging conflicts with nations, to rest content, in a subdued form of primacy and supremacy in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. They do not desire the question, for reasons already given, to be minutely discussed, and have no particular love for either Romanists or Protestants who now undertake to review, in confirmation or rejection, the venerable claim. Indeed, so delicate has the subject become, that for a long time, if we are properly informed, they have ceased to send to kings and nobles, and the great, those keys, once the proud symbol of a power really possessed, and, in some instances, the bearers of a wonderful virtue.* Although the time has passed for the holy Father to obtain decisions in his favor,

* I remind the reader of the Keys of gold, silver and other metals, that were laid on the tomb of St. Peter, and then sent to princes and others, to assure them of the favor and love of the door keeper of heaven, and of the Clavigers, the Key-bearing vicars. Sometimes those Keys by adding the filings of the chains, by which the apostles Peter and Paul were bound, (like the one forwarded to the queen of king Osway of England,) or by some other manipulations obtained the miraculous power of working miracles. One of the most remarkable of these Keys, is attested and vouched for by Gregory the Great. It is the one sent to Theotistes and Andrew the governors of the children of the Emperor Mauritius. See the account as given by him in Bower's *His. Popes*, Vol. I. p. 463. We may well imagine

based on (like king Osway's related by Bede,) the Key derived power found in Christ's address to Peter, yet it is a truth that the old interpretation introduced by Galasius, and developed by others, is still the favorite one of Rome. The canons of the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, the decrees of Justinian and others, based on such canons, are scarcely a proof of divine right, and hence, whilst by no means discarded, are superseded by an appeal to Math. 16 : 18, 19. To-day the old interpretation stands unrepealed, and we are gravely informed, that the words, in the first clause of the passage, expresses the primacy of Peter, that he is the chief or prince of the apostles. By skilfully assuming that the Pope is a regular successor of St. Peter, and that, in view of a visible unity, &c., such a primacy is regularly transferred to each successor, the links of a connected chain are formed. This idea of primacy is not sufficient to satisfy pride and ambition. Next we are told, that the rest of the passage plainly gives the Keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter and his successors, as evinced in this primacy, and the power of binding and loosening. And, finally, that the supremacy, represented by the Keys, gives supreme legislative, executive and judicial power in all ecclesiastical affairs.* This last feature engrafted, culminated in the deposing of kings, the absolving of subjects from oaths of allegiance, and the disposing of kingdoms. It may, indeed, be admitted, that even some Roman Catholic writers † have denominated

trivial as the thing may appear, what awe this Key was to inspire in those destined for an imperial station. It was associated with the fearful death of an unbeliever—perhaps an unintentional unbeliever.

* That this is not overstated, I refer to "the Dictates" of Hildebrand, the Lives of the Popes, immediately preceeding and following the Hildebrandic period, the annals and labors of Bellarmine and Baronius, to establish this view, the testimony of Romanist and Protestant church historians, and the history of nations who resisted this claim, and were urged to war in antagonism to it. In this country efforts are made to conceal or underate the effectual witnessing of history, saying, that the Pope acted as supreme Judge, in deciding concerning empires and kingdoms in temporal matters when solicited, or when the necessities of the Church demanded it, &c., &c. See, also, Schmucker's Pop. Theol. ch. 27.

† Especially by those in the interests of kings who were striving to resist the encroachments of the Pope's temporal power.

this climax, this last development of power, to be a "Hildebrandine heresy," but, that it also stands unrepealed, is seen in the canonization of Hildebrand, and his being honored as a saint, in the teachings of their standards in theology, in the boasted perpetuity and infallibility of their canons and decrees, if confirmed by Pope and Council, and even in the principles of the honored and statedly repeated famous bull, *In Cœna Domini*.*

On the other hand, the Reformers and their co-laborers, discarding the Popish view, returned to the interpretation of the passage, as given by the Fathers. To avoid undue repetition, we shall introduce their explanations in part, with that of others, whilst endeavoring to present a continuous (and to us a consistent) explanation of what we deem the true meaning of the passage. Whilst we cheerfully acknowledge our indebtedness to all these, and lay no claim to originality, in the conception of the various points thus brought together, yet, we deem it proper to say, that thus endorsing what others have truly and plainly said, we do not find in our reading, (although such may exist, owing to our imperfect acquaintance with many writers, whom we only know through quotations,) one writer who has adopted, from the varied interpretations, precisely the following explanation. The combination of several views, one part held by this one, and the other by

* This could be illustrated by the more recent action and words of the Pope towards King Emanuel, the allocution directed against laws enacted by Austria, &c. In the latter, it may be appropriate to recall the fact, that the holy Father, in virtue of the inherited power vested in him, declares that those laws, (withdrawing in part the bondage of ages,) are "null and powerless in themselves and in their effects, both as regards the present and the future," and exhorts all, "not to forget the censures and spiritual punishments which the ecclesiastical institutions and Œcumenical councils inflict, as having been deserved *ipso facto* by the violators of the rights of the Church. Scarcely any document of importance is issued from the Papal See, in which we do not find, notwithstanding its crippled resources, when compared with its former estate,) the spirit, if not the full claim, put forth. Thus, in the late bull, of an Œcumenical or General Council, this document even has to conclude with a damnable clause, derived from this interpretation. For it declares, that if any one dares to oppose it, or controvert it, "he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of his apostles Peter and Paul."

another, long since privately entertained, seemed necessary to secure the full import of the passage. How successfully this may be accomplished, is left to the judgment and intelligence of the reader. It also does not fall within the scope or design of this article to refute the claim of the Popes, the Gelasian and Hildebrandic theory, saving the refutation that naturally arises from the exegetical examination of the passage, on which it is based. The former is done in detail by the masterly production of Barrow on the Pope's supremacy, the latter may, at least, be confirmed by a renewed investigation.

Preliminary to the passage itself, a few remarks respecting the context may be necessary, as an introductory. The particular honor here bestowed on Peter, is connected with the answer he was permitted to give to a question proposed by Christ. After asking and receiving an answer to the question: "*Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?*" he proposes another, "*But whom say ye that I am?*" Peter replies: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,*" or as others viewing it, in the terms of both questions, "*Thou, the Son of Man, art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" Without pausing to contemplate how far this expressed Peter's faith either in the incarnation of God the Son in Christ, or, in the person of Jesus, as the predicted Messiah, who should establish and gloriously reign in the promised kingdom, it is sufficient for the present purpose to say, that in consideration of this direct confession of faith, our Saviour pronounces him "blessed." "*And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*" This blessing, for which he is reminded of his indebtedness to the Father, consisted, not only in his being honored with this revelation, but in the promise immediately added, that, in some sense, the Church should be built upon him, and that in order to fulfil the divine purpose, certain Keys would be given him.

"*And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church.*" The grammatical connection, as well as the reason following, for the name thus given, teaches unquestionably, that Peter himself is meant. If Peter is not personally designated, then language fails to express a plain, unequivocal sense in sentences. Peter is the Rock, and on this Rock, that is on Peter, the Church

is built. The same figure of a foundation is afterward employed (Eph. 2 : 20, Rev. 21 : 14,) to designate all the Apostles, but that illustration, as will shortly appear, is not applicable to this passage, is not parallel with it, simply because, however much the other Apostles may have afterward partaken of Peter's honor and blessedness, he is singled out, chosen from all the rest, as the exclusive recipient of this promised honor. The early Fathers were so rooted in this opinion, that they bestowed names and titles on Peter, expressive of his having a pre-eminence; and in all expositions, (at least those accessible to us,) whatever interpretation is presented, there is an acknowledgment in some form or other, that a certain precedence must be allowed to Peter. But the difficulty, is to state in what this pre-eminence consisted. This will be considered in the next verse. There is no doubt, that the Roman church, insisting on the natural connection and construction of the sentence, in order to advance their application of it, has influenced many to deny or conceal, or substitute in part, lest too great a concession be made in favor of that Church. Hence, whilst several explanations are extensively used by commentators, theologians and others, we are glad to see that the truth, so obviously taught, is frankly acknowledged in commentaries designed for the masses, and in works more particularly written for the guidance of theological students.* The honor that rightfully belongs to Peter, an honor specially conferred by Jesus Christ, should not be given to others. Something that distinguishes him from all others is evidently and designedly granted, and, instead of forsaking the legitimate meaning of any sentence, it should be our business, with scriptural evidence, to ascertain what this preference or dignity really embraces. Therefore, with the greatest respect for the venerable and eminent men who have held them, we must discard every interpretation that serves to

* Thus, *i. e.*, Barnes' Notes on Math. 16 : 17, and Horne's Introd. Vol. I. p. 343. Barnes says, "The word *rock* refers to *Peter himself*. this is the obvious meaning of the passage." Horne declares, "The connection shows that Peter is here plainly meant, *Thou art Peter*, says Christ, and *upon this rock*, that is, *Peter*, pointing to him; for thus it connects with the reason which follows for the name, in the same manner as the reason is given for that of Abraham, in Gen. 17 : 5, and by Israel in Gen. 32 : 28." The "pointing to him," may or may not be correct.

detract from Peter's honor, or refuses to acknowledge a decided precedence in him; yea, more, that does not allow him a certain primacy belonging exclusively to himself, and not transferable to others. We can have no sympathy with that mode of exposition which undertakes to transpose this building on Peter, from him to a building on Christ, asserting that a building the Church on Peter is contrary to the announcement, that Christ is the only foundation. (1 Cor. 3 : 11.) The fact is, that each of the modes of building presented, are true, the Church is built on Christ, on the Apostles, and on Peter, but each one of these stands on its own merits. There is a sense in which Christ, the Head over all, is the only foundation, and one in which the Apostles, equally, are foundations, and a third, in which Peter alone is a foundation. We therefore, must decline to accept views, which, although far more plausible than those alleged by Romanists, refuse to bestow on Peter that distinction and privilege that rightfully belong to him. Some, making a distinction between *πέτρος* and *πετρα*, inform us, by extended paraphrasing, that its meaning is: "Thou art a little stone; and on thee, Peter, if I were to build my Church, it would fall. It is upon this great, imbedded, immovable, eternal rock, (pointing to himself, viz.: Christ,) that I will build my Church."* Others, without insisting on the difference between the two words, still tell us that when Christ uttered the words, "upon this rock," he turned from Peter, and in some way, by pointing, or otherwise, directed attention to himself. Admitting the appeal to classical authorities, to show a slight diversity in the two words, we might assume, for the paraphrase and pointing are mere assumption, that although Peter was a stone, yet for the purpose contemplated, Christ would make him a rock; or in other words, weak and insufficient as Peter was, yet he should receive strength to become a mighty instrument. Aside from the conjectures embraced in such an opinion, the grammatical construction is opposed to it, there being a direct and explicit reference to Peter himself. Another view, more feasible is this: "Thou art Peter (*πέτρος*, the man who is as

* Thus, *i. e.*, Dr. Cummings' Lec. on Romanism. See "The Bar-net Discussion," p. 445. If my remembrance is correct, in some other place he also teaches that the rock is the confession of faith made by Peter.

a rock,) and upon this rock, (viz.: Peter's confession, which, like a rock, cannot be shaken,) I will build my Church."* Here it is intimated, that because of Peter's characteristics, such as earnestness, decision, and firmness, he is merely complimented, and then, attention is directed, not to Peter himself, but to his confession, previously made. Writers who adopt such an opinion, hampered by the construction of the sentence, and desirous not to exclude Peter entirely, still differ from each other respecting the slight shade of meaning to be attached to the words *πέτρος* and *πέτρα*, (the early Fathers had no such difficulties,) and more particularly, concerning the confession itself. Some think the former word denotes a rock, others, that it signifies a stone, and that there is a rise, rhetorical, in the sentence; some, the prevailing view among them, believe that the latter word, rock or confession denoted by it, is simply faith in the Messiah, as expressed by Peter, or the truth embraced in and connected with Peter's answer to Christ; others tell us that the mystery of the incarnation is meant. Among those varied interpretations (indicating the difficulty of the passage, if the plain meaning is set aside,) we shall select one ingeniously advanced: "Thou art Peter, (that is, that thou art he who has rightly declared the mystery of my person, as the Son of Man,) and upon this rock (this foundation, meaning God's work of revealing to His elect people, the mystery of the incarnation,) I will build," &c.† All such explanations, whatever truth they may contain in the abstract, are open to the serious and incontrovertible objection, that in opposition to the plain grammatical construction they substitute for the person of Peter, something else not specified in the text. They are mere assumptions and inferences. This is exposed by the fact, that the greatest and best of men adopting them have not confined themselves to one interpretation. The Fathers, the Reformers and others, would sometimes call the rock Peter, sometimes Christ, and, on other occasions, the confession of faith or truth. To give an illustration: Augustine gives two interpretations of the rock, one referring it to Peter, the other to Christ, and in his Book of Retractions, says: "I have said in a certain passage, respecting the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him,

* Thus, *i. e.*, Dr. Kurtz, Sac. History, p. 293.

† See Dr. Joens' Notes on Scripture, p. 158.

as upon a rock. * * * But I know that I have frequently afterward so expressed myself that the phrase, 'upon this rock,' should be understood to be the rock which Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, Thou art *πέτρα*, but, Thou art *πέτρος*; for the rock was Christ." The Reformers, pressed by the construction, fell back on the expositions of the Fathers, and, whilst endorsing the idea that Peter was, in some respects, specially honored, affirmed that the rock was either Christ, or the confession made by Peter. Sometimes the one view is given, and then again, the other is presented.† Gathering from all these sources and keeping before us the grammatical force of the sentence, we are inclined to the view, that the name Peter is given to Simon because of the confession made by him, for the contrast of the original name, Simon Bar-jona, is significant. We also think that the meaning of that word, notwithstanding the few classical authorities so laboriously hunted up, cannot be that of "a little stone," for, if the name is bestowed on account of the confession, just made by Simon, the name, given in consideration of that confession, would virtually be a lessening, (belittling) or diminishing of the confession itself.* The cogency of

† The writer was tempted to trace these views, but admonished by the length of the article, forbears, saying, that this is seen in the discussion between Luther and Dr. Eck, Luther's Appeal to the Emperor and nobility, &c. Zwingle also said, "The foundation of the Church is the same rock, the same Christ, that gave Peter his name, because he confessed him faithfully," whilst in other places he refers to the confession of faith of Peter. It appears, if not mistaken, that they sometimes used these as convertible expressions, for, in opposition to Dr. Eck, Lutherendorses both Augustine when he makes the rock to be Christ, and Ambrose when he says, "On that confession of faith the Church is built." It will be seen by reference to Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, that some of the Fathers, by the rock, understood Peters person, others Peters faith, others Christ himself, others Peter including all the Apostles with him. A large number of instances are given, derived from their writings, and on this diversity of interpretation, and ever shifting from one to the other. Barrow, like the Reformers, skillfully arranges a number of arguments against Papal pretentions.

* Bengel, *Gnomon loci*, says : "It is not fitting that such a man

the word Peter lies in the Confession itself. Next, we believe that Simon thus named is personally addressed; for, advantage is taken of the name thus given, meaning a rock or huge stone, (suitable for a foundation,) and the figure of building upon it, is forcibly introduced. Hence, we read it: "Thou art Peter, (a foundation stone or rock,) and upon this rock (or foundation, that is, Peter himself,) I will build," &c. In what way he becomes such a foundation, is stated in the next verse.*

"*And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" The prevailing view of this phrase, although fortified by the names of a host of distinguished writers, we are compelled to discard. Whatever of truth there may be in the declarations fastened on it, that the enemies of the Church, devils and wicked men, should not be able to overcome it, it is also true, that these comments are far-fetched, and do not legitimately flow from the text. We are told that because gates in the walls of ancient cities were used for holding courts, transacting business and deliberating, the word must here be understood to mean "councils, designs, machinations, evil purposes;" and the word "hell, means here, *the place of departed spirits, particularly evil spirits;*" and from hence, "the meaning of the passage is, that all the *plots, stratagems, and machinations* of the enemies of the Church should not be able to overcome it." By the word hell, others include not only the devils, evil spirits, but all wicked men, or men opposed to the Church, because led by Satan. But, why go so far to secure a secondary meaning for the word gates, and the word hell? We are not called on to defend the wild fancies of incipient monkery and established Popery, and, therefore, can return to the primary meaning of these words. Gates being designed for defence, become thus emblematic of power, strength, dominion, and are thus used in numerous passages of Scripture. Hades, translated hell, denotes the

should be called *πέτρα*, with a feminine termination; on the other hand St. Matthew would gladly have written *ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρᾳ*, if the idiom would have allowed it; wherefore these two, *πέτρα* and *πέτρος*, stand for one name and thing, as both words are expressed in Syriac by the one noun, *Kepha*."

* Bengel has some excellent remarks in his *Gnomon*, and Olshausen *Com. loci*, showing that in any interpretation, the person of Peter, must not be discarded.

grave, death, or the place of the departed. Dr. Knapp, in his Lectures on Theology, p. 545, (and with whom all our best critics correspond,) says: "The term Hades is not used in the Scriptures, to designate specifically this place, (viz.: the place of punishment after the judgment,) for Hades is the name given to the kingdom of the dead, *where the righteous and the wicked both abide after death.*" Some interpret it as if it read the gates of Tartarus, or the gates of Gehenna; and some commentators, actually forgetting the meaning of the word Hades, as given by themselves in other places, agreeably to Dr. Knapp's definition, make the plots, &c., of Hades, an imputation on the righteous. For, undesignedly, they charge the inhabitants of Hades with plotting, &c., against the Church, and as the righteous are also in Hades, (even as Christ was,) they virtually accuse them of trying to overthrow the Church. Such is the absurdity into which we fall, if we thus explain the passage. We, therefore, vastly prefer the version given by Dr. Jones, without comment in his Notes on Scripture, (with whom others agree,) "The gates of hell (that is the death) shall not prevail against it." The entire phrase, therefore, imports that the power, strength, or dominion, exercised by death, shall not prevail to overcome the Church. The gates of Hades could not retain Jesus Christ, and they will not hold the righteous who shall, by the power of a better resurrection, come from the land of the enemy. Therefore, it is, that in strict accordance with this promise, the Apostle, when describing the resurrection of the righteous, exclaims, "O grave, (marginal reading, hell, so Luther's version,) or Hades, *where is thy victory?*" We regard the expression equivalent to that employed in Scripture, "the gates of death," with the idea of place attached.* The explanation given by many Commentators of Acts 2 : 27, 31, completely refutes their previously rendered one of this passage.

* As the writer holds to the doctrine of the first resurrection, as held by Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and a host of others, he may, disclaiming the idea of obtruding his Millenarian views, in a foot note, be allowed to say : That he regards this passage, as one of those indirect, but beautiful confirmations of his doctrine, that after the first resurrection only, when the gates of Hades are open to the righteous, but remain closed to the wicked, until the thousand years are ended, the Church, thus delivered from the bondage of death, (that is the

"And I will give unto thee the Keys of the kingdom of heaven." The plural form indicates that more than one Key is intended. The Fathers, the Reformers, Commentators and others, generally speak of two keys, and that this is the number, will appear evident from what follows. The word "Key," is used Luke 11 : 52, to denote the means or power of attaining knowledge, and Rev. 1 : 18 ; Isa. 22 : 22, &c., power or authority. Perhaps, Christ had in his mind, the custom mentioned by a Commentator. Dr. Clarke, *Com. loci*, states, that when the Jews made a doctor of laws, they put into his hand the Key of the closet in the temple, where the sacred books were kept. This was regarded as emblematic of the power, or authority, or means given to explain and expound the books of the law. Whether the Saviour thus alluded to this practice or not, all admit that these Keys were committed to Peter, (the Romanists confining them to him; the Fathers, Protestants and others, agreeing that they are first given to him, and then extended to the other apostles,)* and that

Ecclesia, the company of those called forth, separated or elected first) is to be exalted. The key to these gates, now at the girdle of the coming One will not only deliver from the enemy still oppressing them, but will open to those prisoners (so called) an entrance into that honor, power, glory, priesthood, and kingship, promised. The gates, alas, are firmly closed, and the departed and departing *Ecclesia* cannot come to us, but we are assured, by the precedent given through the Redeemer, that He has power to open them. May He hasten that happy period! The reader will pardon this allusion, (which gives a glimpse of the full import of the promise,) the more readily, when he reflects, that not only Chiliasts have taught, that the exalted condition of the Church predicted and still future is preceded by a literal first resurrection, or deliverance from "the gates of death," and "Hades," but, that even some of our most bitter opponents, have admitted and taught the same, limiting it, however, to the martyrs, and, perhaps, to some of the eminently pious. See, for instance, Prof. Stuart's *Com. on Rev. ch. 20*, and several *Excursus* based on that chapter. This introduces the subject noticed by Paul, 1 Cor. 15 : 13—19, of the necessity of the resurrection of the righteous, to ensure a perfected Redemption.

* This needs a slight modification, even some few Romanists have in part adopted the views of Protestants ; and a few Protestants have in part adopted the opinion of Romanists, viz. : that the power

they gave him the power, or authority, or means by which persons, others, are introduced into, or rendered worthy of, the kingdom of heaven. Whilst we may cordially endorse the position of some popular Commentators, (*i. e.*, Barnes) that by the bestowal of these Keys, Christ "means that He will make him (Peter) the instrument, of opening the door of faith to the world, the first to preach the Gospel to both Jews and Gentiles;" yet, this is far from giving us the full import of the passage. Whilst Peter is made such an instrument, it is said, that he becomes such by first preaching, &c., but this really is waiving the question of the Keys. That he is to become such an instrumentality, we already infer from the previous promise, that the Church is to be built upon him; that he is to preach, is true of all the others, and his being *first* to preach, is only a *part* of the honor due to him. To enable Peter to become this instrument, and to preach first to Jews and Gentiles, certain Keys are given to him, and the question still remains unanswered, *what are these Keys?** The only way to an-

of the Keys is solely given to Peter. Thus, *i. e.*, in reference to the latter, Barnes' *Com. loci*, says: "The 'power of the Keys' was given to *Peter alone*, solely for this reason; the power of 'binding and loosening' on earth was given to the other apostles with him." The fact is, both parties hold to a portion of the truth; it is true, that these keys were first given to Peter, and, without their being thus given, the power prefigured, could not have been exercised, and in this sense, they were alone bestowed on Peter; but, it is equally true, that taking the very interpretations of the Keys presented by them, the same power, *saving the priority in their use*, was given to others, and in the case of Paul, without previous consultation with others. Hence, it is not strictly correct, to confine the power of the Keys to Peter alone, because he had a priority in their use, and, it is not proper to say, that the power of the Keys was given in the same way to all the apostles, because, that would be overlooking this priority. Our language should be such, that we neither deny Peter's precedence or pre-eminence in this respect, nor refuse to bestow the same power to all the other apostles.

* Luther's views respecting the Keys may be briefly expressed. He endorses the idea, that they consist in proclaiming the terms of salvation, as Peter did to both Jews and Gentiles; that all can use these Keys; and that the Gospel is thus proclaimed, then is attached the power of declaring absolution, in the case of those who accept, and condemnation in those who reject the conditions of salvation.

swer with confidence, is to investigate the record of Peter's apostleship, and see whether any Keys were bestowed upon him, by which not only authority was given, but by which this door was opened. After the ascension of the Lord, the apostles waited at Jerusalem, for the promised Comforter. On the day of Pentecost, the first Key was given. Filled with the Spirit, Peter proclaimed, (Acts 2 : 14—46,) the crucified, risen Redeemer, to be the promised Christ or Messiah, who should sit on David's throne, and who should remain at the right hand of God, until the period of royal manifestation. The unbelieving Jews, now convinced by the miraculous outpouring, the former life of Jesus, the emphatic language of Peter, that this same Jesus, whom they had mercilessly crucified, was, indeed, both Lord and Christ, were deeply affected, and asked : "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Well might they ask such a momentous question, guilty as they were of the most stupendous crime, that of slaying their own promised Messiah, the royal seed of David, the Son of God. Where was the man with the adequate knowledge and authority to answer it, so that forgiven, they also might enter the kingdom of God? He stands, happy provision, before them. It is Peter. The Key of authority, and of knowledge is committed to him, and he, standing up, graciously informs these Jewish people, that wicked as they were, they still could be saved. Clad with authority, he opens with his Key the door of mercy, by saying : "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." The Key, therefore, consists *in the authority given to him by a special revelation*, that even the murderers of the Messiah, could be forgiven, and *in the making known the conditions*, on which that forgiveness could be granted. The other apostles concurred in the employment of this Key, and *through* Peter it was given to them. For several years it was *the only Key* committed to Peter, and through him to the other apostles, and it was specifically designed for the Jews. But a second Key is to be given. The Gentiles are to have part in this salvation, but the first Key does not meet the provision necessary to extend it unto them. It embraces, in-

The latter, may be said to be declarative, the penitent and believing are assured of the kingdom of heaven, the impenitent and unbelieving are as certainly assured of exclusion.

deed, the same conditions, that are found in the second Key, but *lacks the authority* to open the door to the Gentiles. The first, required a special revelation; the second demands the same. Hence, as Peter was designed to become the instrument, *another Key* must be given to him, to open to the Gentiles, the door of salvation. The manner in which this Key was given, is presented in detail, in Acts 10, and we find that, by special revelation, the authority was given, to engraft the Gentiles. As soon as the Key was thus committed to Peter, he used it, God endorsing it by the gifts of the Spirit, and the other apostles, after hearing Peter's report, and finding it to agree with God's word, cordially received it, and afterward faithfully employed it. In virtue of its being thus granted to Peter, it was, also, without communication with Peter, presented to Paul. Here, then, we have the two Keys, *one designed for the Jews, the other for the Gentiles*. The bestowal of the first was necessary to indicate with absolute certainty, that even the Jews, so guilty, could be saved; the bestowal of the second was indispensable, since the covenants, promises, &c., belonged to the Jewish nation, and all who were saved must become the seed of Abraham. Passing by the consideration of the phrase "kingdom of heaven," which would unduly swell our article, we may add, this explanation, derived from the history of Peter, clearly teaches the correct sense in which he was the selected instrumentality, rock or foundation upon which the Church is built. Without those Keys, thus given to Peter, both Jews and Gentiles would be debarred; the former by their awful guilt, the latter by their not being the natural seed of Abraham. Through Peter's instrumentality, both can be saved, for the Keys unlock the door, affording access. Therefore, it is, that whilst other foundations were added, whilst Jesus is the chief corner stone, or the true foundation on which all rests, the promise to Peter is couched in the very language, best adapted to present us with the idea, that to Peter the Church is greatly indebted, and that to him belongs a peculiar, distinguishing pre-eminence. It is a pleasant reflection, that Peter, conscious of this priority in the grace of God, never presumed to plume himself on an honor granted by divine favor. His conduct is in striking contrast to that of his pretended successors.*

* It has been a matter of astonishment, that in view of the im-

And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, (lit. in the heavens): and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven, (lit. in the heavens)." Without entering into a discussion, respecting the opinions others have entertained concerning this verse, it may be sufficient to say, that whatever is denoted by it, Peter, in this instance, is the recipient of the promise. The question, whether the power of forgiving, or not forgiving sins, of excluding from, or again receiving to, church-fellowship, does not properly belong to the consideration of this passage. It arises from it, but this power possessed by the apostles in common, must be based on Math. 18 : 18, John

portance of the subject, and the convictions of the Reformers, the Augsburg Confession passes by the primacy of the Pope, and softly touches the power of the Keys. We must, with Kollner, Niemeyer, D'Aubigne, and others, believe that "the Augsburg Confession had been prepared with the view to give the least possible offence to their opponents." Indeed the confessions of Melancthon in reply to Luther, Zwingle and others, clearly indicate it. A brief notice of some facts, may, in this connection, be interesting. In the last article, treating of the authority of the bishops, it is said : "We, therefore, teach, that the power of the Keys, or of the bishops, is conformably with the Word of the Lord, a commandment emanating from God, to preach the Gospel, to remit or retain sins, (that is, as they afterward explained, declaratively and not absolutely,) and to administer the sacraments. This power has reference only to eternal goods, is exercised only by the minister of the Word, and does not trouble itself with political administration." After these words were read by Chancellor Brück, and presented to Charles V. there followed the deep-laid intrigues, which led Melancthon to make those fatal concessions, and write that most remarkable letter to the Cardinal Campegius, the apostolic legate, in which, contrary to his previous writings, and the language of the Confession itself, he says : "We have no doctrine different from that of the Romish Church." : "We are prepared to obey the Romish Church, if with that mildness which she has always manifested toward all men, she will only overlook and yield some little, which we could not now alter if we would." "We reverently pledge obedience to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and to the entire organization of the Church, only let not the Pope of Rome reject us." "For no other reason do we incur greater hostility in Germany, than because we defend the doctrines of the Romish Church, with the utmost steadfastness." (I have availed myself of Dr. Schmucker's translation of the letter, in Luth. Symbols.) We

20 : 23, &c., for the context and language clearly indicates the meaning. Here, the import is not so plain, owing to the fact, that this additional promise is connected with these Keys, and is given personally to Peter, in view of his possessing or using them. Some think, that the depth of meaning is, by no means, exhausted by what has occurred, or will occur, down to the close of this dispensation, and that it requires the period, when the saints enjoy perfected Redemption, and Peter is seated on his promised throne, to realize the fulness of the promise. One writer, considering its relation to what is still future, frankly says:

now know the history of Melanchthon's fears and tears, when under the Imperial and Papal pressure, in self-defence for such humiliation, he afterward asked: "Was it necessary to ask if all Christians are priests, if the primacy of the Pope is of right divine," &c., and then answered, "No! all these things are in the province of the schools, and by no means essential to faith." Luther, not disturbed by the threats and fears that so deeply affected his co-adjutor, seeing and feeling the vital importance of these questions, relating to the claims of the Pope, says: "Satan sees clearly that your Apology has passed lightly over the articles of purgatory, the worship of saints, and, above all, of the Pope and of Antichrist." Bucer, Zwingle and others, coincided with Luther, and refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the bishops or Pope. Melanchthon, and those with him, made even greater concessions; they proposed, for the sake of ecclesiastical discipline, to restore to the bishops their jurisdiction, if they would not prosecute them, and to acknowledge of human right, the Pope as supreme bishop. In reference to the Pope, the language was used: "Although the Pope is Antichrist, we may be under his government, as the Jews were under Pharaoh, and in later days under Caiphas." Two prominent men stood firm to the truth. The Chancellor Brück said: "We cannot acknowledge the Pope, because we say he is Antichrist, and because he claims the primacy of divine right." On the day Luther learned of these concessions to bishops and the Pope, he penned five letters, in all of which, he utterly repudiates them as dangerous, and opposed to the truth. Protest after protest effectually crushed them. In all this we say, that whilst the leading Reformers, Luther and Zwingle, and many others, were opposed to yielding anything that would endorse the pretensions of the Papal See, it is also a truth, that Melanchthon, and those with him, were unwilling to give up their own opinions respecting these pretensions and claims, and were only willing, for the sake of peace and

"What, precisely, is the import of this promise to Peter, we know not." After reflecting over the verse and pondering the suggestions of Dr. Knapp, Dr. Kurtz, Dr. Jones, various commentators and others, we confess that this is by far the most difficult portion of the passage. The dogma of the Romanists rests on mere assumption, and the opinions of some of their opposers is pure conjecture. So far as the import may relate to the period of the second Advent we have nothing to say, for we acknowledge our inability to comprehend it, but so far as it relates to this dispensation we may, with a consciousness of our weakness, say, that it appears to us not to relate so much to church discipline as to the action of, or rather the result following the use, of the Keys. Keeping in view how, as Lightfoot, Wetstein and commentators generally inform us, the Syriac, Chaldaic and Rabbinical writers employed the words "binding and loosing," to signify a "forbidding and allowing," we may admit the explanation afforded by some, viz: that whatsoever Peter forbid or allowed should be of divine authority, meeting the divine approbation and ratification. Now in observing the action of these keys, we notice that to the Jews and Gentiles they, on a divine

security, to concede a primacy and supremacy to the Pope, grounded on human right, expediency, and ecclesiastical discipline. This is seen from the language still used by them respecting the Pope. Did Melancthon truly believe, that the Pope would so far humble himself, as to accept a supremacy thus accorded? It appears so; and yet it is difficult to reconcile this with the knowledge he had of the Papacy, unless we consider, that the intrigues and hopes held out by Papists, influenced him to entertain such a project. I have in my possession, a copy of D'Aubigne's *Hist. of Ref.*, once belonging to the lamented Dr. E. Keller. It is interspersed with remarks, in pencil marks, made by his own hand, and signed by his initials. In vol. 4, p. 196, where the author notices the silence of the Confession on the divine right of the Pope, &c., and expresses the opinion, that "If the Reformation, instead of all this circumspection, had advanced with courage, had wholly unveiled the Word of God, and had made an energetic appeal to the sympathies of reform then spread in men's hearts, would it not have taken a stronger and more honorable position, and would it not have secured more extensive conquests?" Dr. Keller appends that brief, favorite and emphatic note: "No doubt—E. K." The lack of an article directly on the primacy and supremacy of the Pope, has always been regarded by me as a serious defect.

authority personified, or represented, in Peter by the gift of the Spirit, imposed certain conditions and these were insisted on as a prerequisite for admittance into the kingdom of heaven. These Keys thus became "a savor of life or of death," yea more, even those accepting their aid, place themselves under obligations to accept all that Peter announces to be necessary unto salvation, and that whatever may be the result of Peter's announcements or commands in the deliverance or condemnation of men, the same will be ratified by God. That result, whatever it may be, will be known and manifested in the coming kingdom of Christ. We may therefore take leave of this verse with the remark, that in whatever light we may regard it, whether directly teaching the power contained in the Keys, or the result obtained by their use, or both, it appears conclusive that if the preceding explanation of the Keys is the correct one, no exposition would be given it, which will make it contradictory to those Keys or that will, so far as church discipline is concerned, give Peter a power above that possessed by the other apostles.*

We learn that a primacy is therefore to be accorded to the apostle Peter, not indeed such as the Popes have claimed, but one that gives him the decided precedence of first obtaining and using the Keys. This honor of being thus first selected to present the knowledge of salvation to

* It may be allowed, in a foot note, to add, that in view of the ancients having their doors, &c., closed with bands, and not with locks like ours, and, that consequently, as writers inform us, (*Ency. R. Knowl. Art. Keys*,) the Key was used to loosen, or fasten, or bind these bands in a peculiar manner, it has occurred to the writer, that this loosening or fastening, according to the use made of Keys, is only applicable to the Keys. If so, then knowing from the fulfillment what the Keys are, we are at no loss to comprehend the meaning of loosening and binding. In the text, however, its meaning is extended somewhat beyond this, as a sort of compromise between the extreme opinions on the subject. Taking the Rabbinical idea of binding and loosening, we must attach to these words the notion of a decision, making something lawful or unlawful. I very much admire Bengel's (*Gnomon*) view: "By the expression therefore of binding and loosing are comprehended all those things which Peter performed, in virtue of the name of Jesus Christ, and through faith in that name, by his apostolical authority," &c.

both Jews and Gentiles and of having it bestowed by special revelations, is not transferable to others. We may admit that these Keys were successfully employed by others, but we cannot admit that this honor belongs equally to all. Peter is distinguished from all others, by this pre-eminence being given to him, and, whilst it did not authorize him to lord it over the flock, or over the rest of his brethren, it did give him the authority to open the door of salvation to Jew and Gentile, and thus teach all others that his declarations could be safely followed, since he was clothed with divine authority. In this sense also the Church is built upon him, for it is through his instrumentality that the way for gathering out a true seed of Abraham is made plain. It is singular to notice, that whatever may have been the views entertained, all freely confess that the language of Christ, in some way, indicates a superiority of some kind over the rest. The Fathers impressed by this language gave many names to Peter indicative of this, such as the first, greater, prince, head, president, &c., and later writers, equally influenced, award to him a pre-eminence and chiefly name him "the first Apostle." Whilst all feel and acknowledge that a primacy is due to Peter, some place it in the bestowal of the Keys as we have explained it; others in the reception of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; some in personal worth or merit; others in the desire to preserve order or unity; some, in the age of the apostle; others, in the representation of a tendency of the gospel, &c. We leave the reader to judge, from the language addressed to Peter, the prevailing impression that some kind of a primacy is intended, and from the appeal we have made to the history of Peter, which view best accords with the promise and actual fulfilment. Having said that the primacy we advocate is not transferable, we may, for fear of being misunderstood, be allowed to add: These Keys were, after Peter had used them, given to others, but the honor of receiving them, making them known and first using them belongs to Peter. It is an honor of a personal nature,—a personal privilege accorded, which belongs exclusively to him and is extinguished in him. They could not all be the first one, nor were the Keys given to all at the same time. Peter is purposely selected to receive them and in being thus chosen, he is honored beyond the other apostles. It therefore belongs to him personally and cannot be transmitted or transferred, but will remain his, now and forever.

The question has been agitated from the days of the Fathers until the present time, why it is that Peter is thus distinguished from the other apostles and selected in preference to others in the reception of the Keys. Some attribute it to characteristics, previously exhibited by Peter; others to the confession of his faith, etc. Considering the failings of Peter and his character in contrast with John's or Paul's, it becomes a matter of great difficulty to answer the question. We know not what reasons influenced the mind of the divine Master, and for aught we know, the selection was not dependent on anything that Peter possessed or had done. The explanation given by Chrysostom is the one most generally entertained: "Peter had his name from a rock, because he first merited to found the church by firmness of faith." But this is open to the objection, that in no sense did he merit by what he had previously received as a gift from the heavenly father. The sovereignty of God is displayed in the choice, and how far that was affected by anything in Peter is mere conjecture. As to the bestowal of the name rock, the reason assigned by Ambrose or some ancient homilist, quoted by Barrow, is the best that can be given: "He is called a rock, because he first did lay in the nations the foundations of faith," for as Tertullian says: "The event sheweth the Church was built on him, that is, by him; he did initiate the Key; see which, 'ye men of Israel hear these words, et'c."

The explanation that we have given of the Keys enables us to receive both the eulogies, that the Fathers heaped on Peter, and their representations, that all the apostles and even all ministers or bishops likewise possessed these Keys. Whilst many of them allowed to Peter the honor, as history attested, of first receiving and using them and that for this he is deserving of special respect, they also insisted, that this gave Peter no power or jurisdiction over the other apostles, and that these Keys were given to all ministers. A few quotations out of the abundance, cited by Barrow, will serve to illustrate this.

Chrysostom, allowing that all have the Keys, says of Peter: "Although John, although James, although Paul, although any other, whoever may appear performing great matters; he yet doth surpass them all, who did precede them in liberty of speech, and opened the entrance, and gave to them, as to a river carried with a huge stream, to enter with great ease, etc." Optatus says: "He did alone receive the

Keys of the kingdom of heaven to be communicated to the rest." Theophylact declares: "Although it be spoken to Peter alone, *I will give thee*, yet it is given to all the apostles." Ambrose writes: "All we ministers have in St. Peter received the Keys of the kingdom of heaven." Such testimony, in view of the tendencies of the writers, may not indeed be of great value, yet, in view of the age in which they lived, an age when strenuous efforts were made to exalt the bishops and organize a hierarchy, it is valuable, because it shows that, as numerous other writers testify, even Jerome among them, the interpretation of the passage, received from the earlier Fathers and the plain tenor of the language, could not be readily overthrown or removed. The struggles that had already taken place respecting the parity of ministers had not caused them to reject the plain meaning and it was only when the Bishop of Rome was in danger of losing a primacy, based on expediency, civil intervention and the greatness or majesty of the city occupied by him, that another interpretation, utterly antagonistic to the text, history and analogy of practice in the church, was introduced. In opposition to this Gelasian and Hildebrandine interpretation various solutions were sought out, but all of them, more or less, in sympathy with the utterances of the earlier Fathers, for they all agreed that the power, exercised by Peter, was also manifested in the other apostles and that whatever precedence must be conceded to Peter, it did not confer an exclusive jurisdiction or remove an equality of power among the apostles. We may therefore close this article by saying, that such has been the progress of exegesis, the critical investigations of the Fathers, the advance of events in the Romanist and Protestant churches, that we are no longer required to resist theses like Tetzels or Eck's, or the more authoritative utterance of a Florentine and Lateran Council. These latter, whilst unrepealed, are, by the necessities of the case, superseded by a more moderate estimate of the power of the Keys. Even this estimate is alike opposed to the promise and the fulfillment of it in Peter's experience, and becomes more and more weakened in the minds of many, now its professed supporters, as they investigate its proposed connection with this passage. The recent events in Italy, Austria, Spain etc., indicate that the interpretations of the Fathers and of Protestants are contrasted with the Gelasian hypothesis.

ARTICLE III.

THE WILL.

By Rev. ALLEN TRAVER, A. M., Andover, N. Y.

The personal, active and self-acting soul of man, is endowed with a power which is designated the Will, in distinction from its other powers. This is, also, one of the chief elements that distinguishes us from the brute creation. An appropriate object presents itself to our consideration, and after deliberation there must be a choice made. The soul has the capacity for determining to seek the object for which there is an inducement. It also has the power of rejecting an inducement and turning aside from the solicitation, and making an opposite, the object of choice. Man is what he is, and cannot be otherwise than man, because he is endowed with the power of choice.

The worth of the human soul cannot be fully measured, unless we take a full view of the Will and point out its distinct prerogatives, and consider its elemental position and integral office in the soul. The capacity for a broader range of effort and a higher style of activity in the earth than belongs to the brute creatures, is a leading characteristic of human nature. The power of discerning between a right and a wrong action is a necessary attribute of rational and intelligent beings. The power of choosing between two courses of action; between right and wrong; good and evil, the Will, as a constituent of the spirit, exalts him above all nature and creatures. Hence we must consider the nature, the office and the workings of the Will, as a fixed truth, from which there is no escape, and in view of which we are responsible.

I enter on the consideration of this subject with a conviction, that there is not only a Will power in man, but that it is free from the restraints of natural law, in its ordinary action within its own sphere; and that we are fearfully responsible in view of the gift. It will not do for us, endowed with reason, to say that the Will is simply another name for the power exerted over the mind by sensa-

tions and ideas, and that as these, or their combinations, are strong or weak, external action, under their influence, does, or does not take place. We say that reason is the man himself, in action or the attitude of thought: and that emotion or sensation, whatever may be the nature of that emotion, is the man himself feeling. The Will is an agent not outside of man, but an agent in the sense of the man himself, determining by an actual choice, selecting, between two or more objects, truths, or courses of action. There is a power, in the nature of man, by which we are enabled to determine. This we call the Will. It is believed that we sustain certain relations to law; and government; and duty; and God, and to one another. No one denies these positions, no one attempts to prove them. They are the instinctive belief of the race. Unless there is a free natural, moral Will, there cannot be in any legitimate sense, sin, or wrong, or evil desert in the system. Deny this, and we can ignore all the natural and instinctive and actual distinctions between moral and natural evil, and right and wrong, and treat sin as we would a wounded or diseased limb. The sense of right and wrong are deeper in the human soul than to allow of eradication. The Will is that power, by which we choose between the right and the wrong; the good and the evil.

In the attainment of knowledge, or in feeling, there are certain exercises put forth. When we will, we put forth energy quite different. All our emotions and judgments, while they spring from the same central nature and personality that the Will does, in its choices, are quite the reverse of choosing by the means of the free Will. But when there are two objects presented for our consideration, we cannot avoid the act of choice between them, if we would move forward in the discharge of the duties resting on us in the period of trial here. If we open the eye on a beautiful landscape, we cannot help beholding it. When the eye is open there is no alternative but to see it. But will you open the eye, or keep it closed, is a question for you to decide. There must be a choice and determination of the Will.

Suppose that you propose, in view of securing some worthy end, some object highly desirable and good, to journey to a distant part of the State. You also consider the best mode of travel. You compare and balance the facts, which are elicited in the prosecution of the inquiry.

On the whole, you propose to go in your own private carriage. You consider that you can journey leisurely and at your own will. You can rest in the heat of the day. You can have a better view of the country, and can gain a knowledge of its marked features, and notice the peculiarities of that portion which is most highly improved. You are not forced to travel when storms prevail. You are free from the risks of collisions. These facts are influential in forming a conclusion, and you choose, you elect to secure the object before you, which you cannot do without the visit. It is noble and worthy and you resolve on its attainment. Furthermore, you decide on the mode, in view of the agreeable and home-like mode and because of adaptation to incidental or secondary desires and ends. Before you start, there must be the attitude of the Will in determination to travel in the way in which you do. There may be inducements of an opposite nature held out to the mind. There may be ideas, motives, incentives, emotions, promptings in the opposite direction and for another object. But they are not the prevailing ones, for you determine in view of the former. This is what is meant by the mental act of willing and that, by which this choice is made, we denominate the Will.

We may feel within the sinful heart the risings of envy, hatred, revenge of a burning malice and a desire to secure some object, and these become incitements to fearful crimes. But before there can be actual murder, and the real guilt of the crime, there must be a determination to it. All the malicious and passionate burnings in the soul, constitute the man a murderer in disposition, though not in act. When ever there is a wrong perpetrated, there is a moment, as the wrong doer well realizes, when he yields to the evil motive and inducement to the horrid crime, nay, more when he determines positively to commit the crime. But man is not a machine, who must yield to ideas, sensations and motives, but he can rise superior to these and chain them to their place, whether good or evil and act in accordance with the remotest opposite. Again suppose that I feel the cravings of hunger, or thirst or some other desire. These desires are unavoidable, as we are well assured. There is this want of the animal system. But as the result of a disease that is preying on me and also from certain drugs that have been administered by my physician,

medicinally, it may not be proper or good for me to receive water and, therefore, I determine to abstain. I have a will power, moved by motives, which rises triumphant over my mere animal longing, my burning thirst or growing hunger, and it prevails in view of what seems a higher good than mere bodily want. "I am conscious, in my spiritual being of the possession of a supernatural agency. When appetite craves, in weaker or stronger measures, I can see in my spiritual being another law than highest happiness and I feel the claim of spiritual worthiness; and I can put this over upon the weaker appetite against the stronger, or over against all appetite that is in collision with it, and I have in this an alternative in kind to all that nature may present; and a spring to throw myself against nature, and work my way upward in resistance of it. The desires of flesh may be aroused to their utmost passionate excitement, and all circumstances may favor their indulgence; prudential considerations may seem to lie on some side, and even the promptings of kindness may also concur; and thus the unbroken current of nature may tend towards gratification; but if I also see, that such indulgence would degrade and debase my spirit; I shall, in this claim of my rational being, have a full alternative to all of nature's promptings. Let constitutional nature do her best or her worst, I may still stand in my spiritual integrity, regardless of either the happiness or the suffering that weighs itself against duty. There is in this capacity of the spirit, that which is out of, and above, nature; a determiner when gratification may be, and when it may not be with honor to the soul; and in the alternative of worthiness to happiness, thus opened, no alluring temptation from constitutional nature can ever come upon man and be truly unavoidable. It is the right of the spirit to control and use the sense for its own highest excellency; and it is due to itself to put the flesh to any sacrifice or endurance which may preserve or exalt its own true dignity; and thus in its own behalf, the spirit may contain all enjoyment and all suffering that nature can give."*

Man, having this free Will is able to receive or reject certain ends of action. He is also able to act in accordance with the promptings of certain motives. Inducements are set before us and draw the mind and heart to them. They are held out as incentives to exertion, and

* Hickok's Science of the Mind, p. 269—70.

as springs of action. There are also motives that propel. One is in advance and holds out a glittering crown, as a reward to the one that seeks, to the desiring spirit. The other reaches us from a different position and propels, and urges us, as with a thong. It says virtually fly to the refuge, as did the angel who visited Lot and his family, when they were out of the city. When a certain end has been made the subject of this election, this choice by the Will, that object may next in order become the permanent choice. Without any wavering we place ourselves in harmony with all that is included in that end. We also assume an attitude of indifference or opposition to all that is good or evil, as the determination of the mind may be.

Having considered the Nature of the Will, the second inquiry that arises is in reference to its Freedom. The doctrine of Fatalism and of Chance have been forcibly advocated and if we admit the premises of their advocates, we must endorse their conclusions. But the range of their influence is limited, from the fact that neither seems to commend itself to the reason, or the common consciousness of mankind. The Greek tragedians seemed to receive the doctrine of fatalism, for in their splendid creations fate seems as a strong muscular chord, running through all the parts from end to end. Their views and conceptions on this subject, were of a tragic, dark and gloomy and awful kind. They represent it as irresistible, and terrible as death. It was a remorseless power swaying gods and men, and was not only man's most dreaded enemy, but a terror to the gods, as it was merciless and uncompromising when they were involed in its movements. It could not be propitiated either by prayer or sacrifice; neither did it give nor receive favor. When the elements subdued, and tramped on man and wrought his destruction, this was a manifestation of fate. In the rolling away of the years of man's life, thus diminishing his opportunities; in the calamities and sorrows and misfortunes of our troubled life; and in the events of death, and the dread of the future, paralyzing courage as a human virtue, and faith as an act of purity, there were seen the movements of fate, which could be stayed, neither by man, nor the gods. The immortals were as thoroughly subjected to its power from the position which they held as gods, as were feeble and dependent men. He who is consistent in his fatalism, cutting off his relations to an authoritative being, and disregarding the future,

only as that is unfolded in the web of a real but blind fatality, cannot be refuted by argument. He differs from his opponents in most of the important points involved in the problem of life. He allows no starting point; grants no principle; and he concedes no premise. He disputes even the reality of moral distinctions, if it is a principle at war with his scheme. Hence logic cannot drive him from his position. Receive his theory, and the disorders of the moral world, he assures you, are accounted for and explained. He reasons as follows: Nature exhibits to us a flow of events, rapid and connected in succession. They are as fated as are mechanical necessities. The present comes up from the past. The future is construed from the present, and there are invariable results. Each point is a force. Each force is an element of advancement, a moving power in the stream, caused and causing in turn. It is first pressed and then presses. The stream of nature moves on with force and power, and bears on its bosom, in the same resistless swell, drift wood, lingering at times in quiet waters, and again floating on the surface in sportive freedom, and then swept on by the same irresistible causal power, to ends which are fixed and unchangeable in all their accidents. Nature knows nothing beyond the sweep of her own vast compass. She draws all things into the current of her ceaseless flow, and only affords an explanation of them, when seen in their relations which are fixed in a chain of necessity.

The fatalist, further, avers that man is a part of the chain; individuals are the separate, yet connected links; or that man is a parasite on the earth, and is somewhat as is the soil, and the various surroundings of life, as education, and the favorable or the unfavorable circumstances of his being. In the external world, the laws and the connections are those of necessity. But the comparisons which are drawn from them are inadequate to explain the nature and operations of the human will, and they are quite antagonistic when arrayed by the side of those that are moral and spiritual and under the direction of providence. A comparison, instituted between the two for illustration, fails to enlighten, and must necessarily mislead us in our discussions on the subject of freedom.

This absolute and universal conception or idea of physical and intellectual causation, denying will-power, if admitted, will eat into and vitiate the force of our philoso-

phy of freedom, and we shall not find in time or place, a position or barrier, which we can make good against it. As we grope our way backward, along the line of history and recorded events, we seek some ultimate point, some grand and infinite fountain, from which universe proceeded, created by an Almighty power. If at every point we find the same facts and conditions, force pressed and pressing, cause before and behind and all precisely analagous to every other point in the dreary waste of causation, we shall find no place to begin or end our inquiries, and our weariness will be our only solace.

Fatalism is a word which gives us no account of events in their origin or destiny, but only their fatal succession, as they transpire in the world's history. It is a subjective idea, or rather notion, and void of vitality, for it assigns no cause for the order of the universe. It makes nature cold and cheerless and remorseless. Every single and simple effect; every phenomenon in all its various combinations must have a cause that is adequate in the Divine will, and along the line of events there must be secondary agencies or causes, or we deny a good, wise and powerful Providence.

When man reduces himself by such a theory, or narrow speculation, to the idea that he is a being who is a joint in nature and merely a natural force, he destroys himself as a personality, and loses the original conception of his free, personal, spiritual agency. He is no longer a creature of self-guiding action, with reason looking before and after. His freedom is denied and he is void of consistency and lives without aim or purpose, and if he admits the existence of God, makes Him only the first link in the chain of nature, and in the system of the universe.

But there are higher analogies and profounder reasonings, which indicate Freedom of Will, in opposition to blind fatalism. He who can reason, must be somewhat like Him who made the reasoning being. He must live in a certain sense, the image of God within him. If we have no freedom, can we assert that we are the creatures made by a free being? When we deny our own freedom, on the ground of the impossibility of the conception, that moment we deny it to God, and earth and heaven sink into the stream of a blind succession, without origin, or end, without a head, or termination. Thus there is nothing above nature; no supernatural; and man is a creature who

drifts, ebbs and flows in a drifting, shoreless universe. Chance, on the other hand is mere fortune or accident. It cuts asunder the laws and ordainments which are necessary in the constitution of relations, and the universe becomes a rope of sand, and disconnected particles and parts. It loosens every bond. It denies certainty and order, and is far less reasonable than sheer fatalism. "Every effect, every phenomenon and combination of phenomenon, must have its cause, and that not only in its parts, but as a whole. Fate or chance are mere words, and give no account of the combinations. They are inadequate, in any sense they can bear, to be causes of the order of the universe. They are so repugnant to common reason and so manifestly insufficient, that the untutored mind instinctively rejects them, and the most competent thinkers will dismiss them from consideration with a brief remark. They can impose upon none but the half-wits."

The ideas of fatalism and chance having been considered, we proceed to notice the principle, that there is freedom of Will, and that a free will in action, must stand between these two. There are laws of mind, most unquestionably, and the mind acts in harmony with them. These laws are certain, and the soul is indissolubly connected with them. Under them the mind acts freely, and with a large range of liberty. The Will acts freely and orderly, uncontrolled, and self-controlling, affected, yet unconstrained, only by the force of motives. The chain of necessity in nature, composed of links well-connected, bind not in this department of creation. The conception which we have of Will; of freedom of the Will; and yet of this free-will under law, can never be fully explained, and neither can or should it render itself a subject of logical criticism. No explanation can be furnished which will harmonize its parts to the mind of man. A process of the reason in logical forms, can only proceed along the links of fixed relations in nature, and only move in this stream. The soul of man, the free-will cannot be sunk into this stream. Our explanations cannot be satisfactory, when they destroy our conceptions, based on centuries of abstraction and study, or when they lead us to throw away with one hand what we have gathered with the other. A free-will is supernatural in some sense, and is above and beyond the flow of nature, and does not share in its necessity. Hence, no explanation which is of nature, and shares in its rigid

and unvarying necessity, can be regarded as adapted to this problem. The spiritual man must rise above natural laws. Freedom of Will consists in this, that, though subject to mental law, in accordance with which it acts, it can at any moment, by an internal self-determining power, begin a new ideal train of mental operations; or it can at pleasure interfere with the sequence of things which are passing in our experience. In saying this, I do not decide how far nature or mental law influences us, or we exert an influence on them.

Man is not free, if he is not the author of his own actions. If that which occurs in the will, and the consequent action is not brought to pass by himself, but is produced by some power out of himself, which uses him as a passive instrument, then as all the defenders of human liberty agree in maintaining, he is not a free being. But what constitutes the free authorship of action? Capacity for locomotion is not the power of producing action, which constitutes freedom, for inanimate bodies have the capacity for movement. But they are as passive in one sense, when in action, as they are when at rest.

There is secondly, in animals a principle through which outward movements may be produced, but they are not accounted responsible for them, as we are for our voluntary actions. There may be mental phenomena unaccompanied by responsible action. A brute, or an insane man may have the same perceptions that a sane man has. There is a form of perception, and memory, and passion, and affection in dreaming, without the shadow of responsibility. Even brutes consider, as well as man, before they act. A dog eyes a leg of mutton in the market, before he seizes it. Appetite moves him, but he is not a responsible author of his own actions, as man is.

His actions arise from his animal, and not from a rational constitution, and are the result of his nature, which is without reason. Therefore, we infer, that capacity for action and determination do not involve responsibility. An insane man may be impressed with the idea of the duty, as well as with the desire to kill a man, and may do so very deliberately. Yet he is not held responsible. But, when a sane man, having the power to give to facts and motives their proper weight, and consideration, and influence, performs the same action, we charge him with the crime of murder, for we say he has reason, and committed the deed deliberately.

The horse, and the domestic animals also judge, but they are unconscious of laws, by which they are governed. The horse, if he reasons, as some suppose, cannot "see reason." He has only the mind of sense, for the groom, the saddle, and the provender. But man reasons, and he sees reason in things, and in the freedom of his purposes and choices, he is responsible. "Men are called rational, because the ideas of their reason are a conscious possession. Their laws of action are not imposed on them by their constitution, and carried into effect by their nature. They are rather set before them to choose." We act from deliberation, not instinct, or impulse, and because it is reasonable. We act not blindly, but we are convinced and persuaded by motives and inducements set before us, and applied to reason. In explaining this fact further, it may be said that to act from right reason, is to act after proposing a reason to the mind, as a motive. Consciously to do good to a fellow creature, because this is the law of God, supposes, first, a recognition of the law as binding. Secondly, it supposes submission to it, as a motive that binds the conscience and heart. Creatures that do not recognize the reason as law to them, cannot yield to law as a reason, nor refuse obedience to the force of instinct, as a law of their nature. We are conscious that certain acts are evil, and others are good. By this element in our nature, we know ourselves; our actions; our mental laws leading to them; our motives; and we put ourselves under these laws and motives. Thus we are the authors of our own actions, and, therefore, we are responsible. We are not only under the influence of motives, but we choose them. When we obey God, we choose the motives connected with his being and nature, and with all the workings of his providence. When we follow evil, we reject the motives and principles which have a connection with God's character and ways, and we seek to follow those that are evil and lower in their nature, and range and character. The cause of certain motives being our motives, is in ourselves, and not in the motives. It may be said that men err in judgment. But they do determine in view of motives. Moral approbation, or disapprobation, are awarded us for our motives, despite our fallibility of judgment. While brutes move from desire, man has his reason intervening. Rational beings can separate themselves from objects, and can consider relations, and can choose self-denial,

or self-gratification. But objects act on a creature of sense, according to laws of its nature, but with man, reason intervenes. And man governs himself by the resultant motive of his determination, after a choice between motives that are very different in their character.

We determine our motives, hence, we originate our actions. And this is the true conception of human freedom, viz. : That we have the power to determine our motives ; and that we determine ourselves by our motives. Despite of our fallibility of judgment, if we carefully seek we will be excused for error, even where more powerful minds were correct in their decisions. Faithful endeavors will be regarded by Him who searches the heart.

The power of choosing between two or more courses of action, between right and wrong, good and evil the Will as a constituent in the spirit, exalts him above all nature and creatures, and constitutes his responsibility.

We have seen that the Will may be defined as "the capacity for electing," though we may not be able to give a complete explanation of the conception. But it is a definition which justifies itself to the consciousness of man.

There are other considerations, which show that this conception of freedom, agrees with fact. There are certain modes of education, which imply it. Children may be educated like animals, but animals cannot be educated like children. The Arab makes his horse kind and affectionate, by kindness. Severity will subdue the vicious propensities of some. Pain may be associated with certain habits, so as to prevent the brute from falling into them, and they may be improved by keeping from them whatever tends to develop and excite their passions. Thus we educate creatures, and make them subservient to our good. We use kindness, or severity in turn, and seek the development of useful qualities, by restraint on their passions, and by eradicating malicious feelings, as far as we can. But children, while we educate, and instruct, and drill them, can at the same time have a motive developed in the soul. They can be taught to make the cultivation of a good disposition, and proper feelings, as an object of value and service to themselves. While the brute may know, and be kind and obedient to his master, he cannot undertake to produce in himself benevolence, as an habitual temper of mind. The state of creature mind, cannot

be parted from the creature, as it is nature, distinct from man; and a mental state made an end of the highest worthiness. They cannot seek the abstract quality, but a child can direct attention to the cultivation of a good disposition, which implies freedom. A brute is not sensible of the constraints caused by the necessity of its nature, and which it obeys. Hence, it does not experience the want of liberty, as one born blind has not the idea of darkness, because he has not that of light. In order to know the privation of darkness, he must have enjoyed the preception of light.

Hence, every analysis of self-consciousness points, to a region which the pretended endless concatenation of blind causes and effects does not reach, and where quite other laws, than the so-called laws of nature prevail, and where a much higher life, the life of the soul unfolds *ad infinitum*, and in the repetition, beholds and recognizes itself. "So far from any thing like that necessary and indiscerptible sequence of interlaced phenomenon, it is on the sole condition of that sequence being interrupted, that consciousness arises, and, on the other hand, this disappears in the exact proportion, as that appears or becomes predominant." Further, that the soul remains conscious of its identity, amid the current of things, and the incessant change of outward phenomenon, and inward states, explains, as no other supposition does, that there is something in the soul which does not belong among these phenomena, and is not subject to their laws, the character of which laws consists in an incessant progression, from the conditioning, to the conditioned—whilst from the consciousness of identity, a something constant is required, which, instead of being borne along by the current, can stem it, or look down upon it from a secure elevation.

What, but the free Will, can render the mind requisite for speculative inquiry? What renders this possible, except that the soul can arbitrarily step out of the perpetually advancing phenomena of external and internal life, and, in the midst of the thread of change, return continually to that which is constant, and elevate itself to that one and last, which never occurs in the stream of sequences, as one of them, but which can be apprehended only by a free introversion of the soul.

The mind could never come into possession of the highest forms of knowledge, by speculation, but would always

remain sunk in the dim perception of sensible objects, and thus be dragged along with material things, which are in a continual flow, and reflow, if it stood under the same laws of natural causality, as things do. There would exist continuance for the mind, without the dawn of things—there would be only eternity, without the dawnings of time. If the human Will is once introduced as a link in the brazen chain, there is no escape for man in the circuit of nature.

Only he who is free can tear himself loose from nature's chain of adamant, and distinguish himself from things. If we consider the phenomena of the physical world, as addressed to the senses, they appear to form an uninterrupted chain, whose links mutually determine each other. They present an interminable, and strictly connected chain of cause and effect, which to all human appearance, is woven into a thread and web, which cannot be broken. But the mind of man, after having, for a time, wearied itself, in the endless succession of visible things, by observing the order and combination of nature, never fails at length to reach a conception, which cannot be included in the experience, and the movements of nature, in all her varied phenomena; nor can it, by any means, be brought into the same rank with matter and sense, and with the ordinances of pure natural law. Liberty is an idea, originally implanted in the soul. Man is incapable of arbitrarily ridding himself of this idea. And we do not mean that each person possesses it in clear and distinct consciousness, though its germ exists in all; since the ideas and conceptions of the ideal, are either entirely misunderstood, or faintly conceived by many in whom real, valid and manifest soul-life, is dimly seen, and faintly developed. They have but little mental growth, and low conceptions of the perfection at which men should aim. In the first dawnings of consciousness, this idea of liberty shines and glows as a practical truth. The soul finds itself a self-acting principle, and finds Will an essential in its existence, and spontaneously acting. Man cannot well imagine himself, as not willing. And through all its active stages to the last analysis of thought and reason, this is found as a living conception and conviction.

The presence of this idea in all our experience, is the pledge of its existence and life, and of a sphere of action, above the apparently indiscrptible connection of a mo-

tion or result, produced by necessary law. Liberty belongs to the very nature of the soul of man. And in like manner the ideas of God, and of immortality, make themselves felt, with a high form of urgency, and they dwell, as we find, in the soul, with an unextinguishable, and it may be, with an unexplained and unintelligible efficacy. And it is one of the main problems of philosophy, to trace these higher indications of life, peculiar to the soul, and to bring them, active and influential as truth, to a distinct consciousness. The idea of liberty becomes more intense by reflection upon the phenomena of the external world, of matter, and the internal world of the spirit, as they are naturally adapted to each other. As we consider the facts, which appear, we are led back by induction, to the beginning of time and events, which originated in something, and by a Power not found in the various phenomena of nature.

Again, as we reflect on our internal intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature and life, we can find rest only in the idea of moral liberty, and we accept it as one of the ultimate facts of the created universe. But it does not follow from this, that the idea of liberty was not in the mind, prior to reflection; or that it was invented by reflective processes, in order to make both worlds intelligible to man, and to move in harmony. It was present before thought and continued reflection, and independent of purpose. The mind in action cannot rest without the idea of liberty. Only he, who is originally free, will be conscious of the pressure of necessity, when it really exists, as original heat is necessary to make cold sensible.

The self-determination of the Will, belongs so essentially to the spiritual Personality, that the former cannot be taken away, only by virtually annihilating the latter. Without this idea of liberty and freedom, man could not speak of his personal *I*, in the ordinary human and rational sense. In the beginning of consciousness, there is found the pure self-determining Will, free in choice, and, hence, freedom is a part of the essence and nature of the Personality, the conscious *I*.

The Will is exercised and determined from motives, considerations, and judgments. The intellect of man goes before the will with a torch, which is the light of truth. And error is a companion on the way, and too often shapes the action of will to itself. By means of the intellect, we

distinguish various things, plans and objects, and consider inducements and compare them with each other. Thus we are furnished with ideas, and motives, and judgments, which lie before the soul, and out of the number before us the Will chooses and determines to follow some one of them. There is no real and valid action, only as there is intellect, and consciousness, and will involved, and self-activity. For action, under these circumstances, we are responsible, but not for a simple sensation, or feeling, or an impression without will and action arising therefrom. Some form of experience and action may be developed in us, according as is the force of natural instincts, and the dark workings of natural laws, and from the unsounded depths of the soul, as for example, when one has an inexplicable aversion for an object, or a magical inclination to it. But the Will must, as a rule, be voluntarily determined to it, and for this we are amenable, for we exercise our freedom. The consciousness of a real action belongs to the spirit, that thinks, and judges, and cherishes motives, and wills, and exercises the power of self-determination, in view of motives. While the human Will is a distinct power, and puts forth energy, it is not exercised apart from our other faculties and powers, but rather it acts from a blended force and basis, found in them all. "It associates itself with our intellectual decisions, on the one hand, and our emotional attainments on the other, but contains an important element, which cannot be resolved into either the one or the other, or into both combined. The other powers, such as the sensibility, the reason, the conscience, may influence the Will, but they cannot constitute it, nor yield its peculiar workings. We have only by consciousness to look into our own souls, as the Will is working to discover a power, which, though intimately connected with the other attributes of the mind, even as they are closely related to each other, does yet stand out distinctly from them, with its peculiar functions, and its own province."*

While we hold to the freedom of the Will, and to the correlative truth, human responsibility, the Will, as we conceive, is directed in its choices and volitions, and all its wonderful and mysterious actions, by motives. It selects these most freely. "By a motive," says Edwards, "I mean the whole of that which moves, excites, or invites the

* Vocab. of Philos, p. 554.

mind to volition, whether that be one thing singly, or many things conjointly. Many particular things may concur, and unite their strength to induce the mind, and when it is so, all together are as one complex motive. And when I speak of the strongest motive, I have respect to the strength of the whole that operates to produce a particular act of volition, whether that be the strength of one thing alone, or many together." Let it be understood, that the motive does not determine the Will absolutely. But the Will determines in view of the motive. The Will gives strength to the motive. It is the man who makes the motive what it is in strength and power over him, and not the motive the man.

There are laws in, and of the mind, which have a connection with the Will, but they lay no absolute restraint on the Will. This is as obvious, as that there are laws of the reason and consciousness, but they do not trammel these faculties and powers of the soul, in the discovery of what is truth, or what is virtue. In like manner, the soul acts during the period of life, but acts under the circumstances of existences, which surround man.

The wills of all rational and voluntary beings go forth in action, and we see their results. This is a fact no one will question. The deeds of man are the record of history in all time, countries and nations. But what causes the determinations of all these minds now existing, and that have existed, and that shall exist, in their choices. Can we declare truthfully and philosophically, "Nothing whatever?"

The Will is free. There is the power of contrary choice. The Will chooses. But is it an absolute determination, independent, and alone and solitary, or is there another element which enters into the sphere of consideration, which becomes part of the drama? There are motives which have influence and power in every particular volition. There are conditions under which the Will acts. These conditions are a part of the power. Hence, can we aver, that the Will is a power absolute, or is there not one or more factors in the problem? The Will is the efficient cause, but there are other and important facts which come in as motives, inducements and reasons. An efficient cause; an adequate cause; and an absolute cause, are by no means identical. The idea of cause, is simple in one respect. But in another it is very complex, for there are

varied circumstances and contingencies, without which the human will never acts. The relation of cause and effect is complicated, as is evident when we consider the complex frame and arrangements of the universe. It may seem simpler in man, in the soul, and yet it is as mysterious, and as wonderful, and as marked, as in nature.

As soon as man begins to think on the subject of Will, and has the idea and conception of its freedom, he launches beyond it in thought. Motives and inducements are the point to which he moves, from the necessity of the reason. There is a relation between these. There is another point, and that is the relation, as a fact. But this is beyond the solvent powers of the chemistry of human thought. It is an element, and has not been analyzed, and never will be, as we conceive.

There is the Thesis of Will; there is the Antithesis; there is the Mesothesis. Who of man can determine the one, without the other? Who can solve either of the triad? Who can determine their relations? This is God's secret. Who dare attempt to step in, where angels fear to tread? Put off thy shoes, for the place, if not holy, is far beyond the measure of thy line.

We have seen that the mind is self-acting, and that the Will, as an element of the soul, is in a large sense, also, self-acting, and a power and a law in itself. This is one of the conditions of responsibility. While circumstances influence us, we are, as free agents, accountable, from the fact, that we can entertain an intelligent view of duty and right, under a wide variety of circumstances. The conscience, also, comes in as a guide and monitor in securing a choice of the Will. This declares between right and wrong, and its dictum is authoritative in its utterances. The use and activity of the Will, is always in connection with the reason, and the degree of intelligence to which we have attained, and the conscience. While they are separate, one principle and one life pervade them. There is spontaneous thought, moral conviction, and free and voluntary choice. The clearer our moral convictions are, and the more distinct and all-pervading our thinking, the higher and more vigorous will be the Will's action. So intimate are reason, will, and conscience, that we may affirm that they are the prevailing consciousness of man; the sublime and simple personal idea which omnipotently sways the individual, and inspires the life. They are the moving of

spirit and feelings, and hold man in happy concord to right and truth and God ; or swing him over in commitment to all evil.

In this Will there is natural freedom, and spontaneous action. But there is, also, a close and intimate connection with moral and spiritual law ; moral obligation and rights. It is morally free, yet it moves under the impulse of warm desires and inclinations, emotions and passions, with attachment to the central personality.

Dr. McCosh, in speaking of the self-acting will, and conscience, and intelligence, as evinced in the moral nature of man, says : "These three, then, seem to be the essential elements, or conditions of responsibility. Every human being, in a sane state of mind, is in possession of all three. The maniac, in some cases, has lost the first, and has no proper power of will. The idiot, and in some cases the maniac, is without the third, or the power of discovering, what is really embraced in a given phenomenon. Without the one, or the other of these necessary adjuncts, there is no room for the right exercise of the second, that is, the conscience ; and the party thereof, is not responsible. In the case of the maniac, as soon as intelligence, and the power of will are restored, the conscience, which is the most indestructible faculty in the human soul, is in circumstances to renew its proper operations."

In view of these considerations, what a wonderful and fearful structure is the spiritual nature of man ! To choose, is one of the grand and elevated prerogatives of man. Consider the soul as the real man. What wonderful endowments ! What a conception is that of the reasoning and thinking ; the willing ; and the moral man. There is intelligence to apprehend all the varied kinds of truth, beauty, goodness and purity, which can speak to the soul. There is moral power, and conscience to consider or discriminate between good and evil. There is the power to make choice of the best, and also the fearful alternative to select the very worst of all that can be elected by the Will.

What a fearful endowment then, is that of choice, and what a blessed act and state of the soul, electing the good, and God as its portion, lawgiver and rewarder, and delight. We can run through the vast chain of varied good and evil, from the highest and the best, to the lowest and the vilest, which can be appropriated and enjoyed by man ; we have the utterances of the conscience in favor of the

good and enduring; and we have the power of choice for the very best, and we are invited to it, with the loving voice of the Saviour of men. What marvels we are to ourselves, and what subjects of wonder to other beings, in the vast universe. What a high order we are, in the chain of beings! What creature is nearer to God in his nature and endowments than man, and yet what one has fallen so low in sin and misery.

God has endowed us most richly, with powers, and emotions, and sentiments, and with reason that can look before and after, and search for truth and virtue, in all realms of the universe. It was most worthy of the Infinite Author of our being, to create us and endow us, that we might be companions who would freely love Him. With this purpose in view, He gave us minds to understand, and affections to love and appreciate, and a conscience to work moral distinctions, and the Will to choose. Thus He provides for a free decision, by giving us powers that act in liberty, and yet are capable of one or the other, of vice or virtue. Having such a state and nature for free action, and exercising choice, we have that which is most possible in a creature finite in nature and state.

When we have the conception of free-will in the ranges of liberty, and consider its relations to all the other powers, it must elevate our apprehensions of the value and the worth of the soul, and deepen the sense of our responsibility for the good or evil we do, and the characters we form. It will, also, give us a clearer sense of the value of the gospel, in that it gives us new opportunities for choice, and that unembarrassed by the transgressions of the past. It also holds out to us new hopes for the future, undarkened by the effects of present sin.

ARTICLE IV.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LXXIII.

JOHN NICHOLAS MARTIN.

The influence of the Christian ministry is as enduring
Vol. XX. No. 79. 49

as time itself. It is transmitted from age to age, through successive generations. In moulding thought, in giving permanence to events, it is not to be measured by commemorative words, or official records. The sweet odor still cleaves to the vase, long after the precious ointment has been exhausted. The good man does not live in vain. His name, so talismanic in its influence, with the lapse of time grows brighter and brighter. The principles which he disseminated, the services which he performed, will never be forgotten. His voice may be hushed in death, his course on earth terminated, but the truths which he enunciated, the great service to which his life was devoted, those hours of patient thought and constant toil, are never effaced. They are interwoven and commingled with the history of the Church, and the love of the Church gathers around the tomb, and hallows his memory. But his work is not yet finished. His deeds live on, and the power of his life and character is felt in eternity. Although more than three score years and ten have passed away, since the subject of our present sketch entered upon his rest, his influence is still seen; it has made an indelible impression upon the endless future.

John Nicholas Martin was born in the Dutchy of Deux-Ponts or Zweibrucken in Rhenish Bavaria, and immigrated to North America about the middle of the eighteenth century. He was then a married man with several children, and came to this country in company with a Lutheran colony, who were under the impression that they would find a more congenial home on these shores. They landed in the city of Philadelphia, with the intention of settling permanently on the rich soil of Pennsylvania, but as most of the desirable land, which could be procured, was already occupied, they passed on to the valley of the Shenandoah, whither many of our German emigrants had already been attracted. Some of these settlements extended for a considerable distance from the North into the great central valley of Virginia, and an opening had been made even into North Carolina. The congregation, to which Mr. Martin ministered, after some hesitation and delay, finally determined to locate in Anson county, near the boundary of South Carolina. A very ancient Lutheran church is still found at this point, which was perhaps the scene of his early labors.

Mr. Martin continued to labor, and to watch over the

Interests of the settlement for several years, when, with the larger portion of his congregation, he removed to a district between the Broad and Saluda Rivers, in South Carolina, a favorite spot with the Germans of that day in the South. The German population in this region very much increased, and Lutheran churches were established on both of these rivers. Mr. Martin here ministered to two congregations, Zion's church on the South side, and St. Michael's, six miles distant on the North side of the Saluda, both of them colonies from the original church. During his residence here, he visited his native land, the scenes of his childhood and of his early labors. The interests of his church seemed, however, to have been the prominent object of his visit. He returned home with a supply of books and other articles which interested his people. In this position of usefulness he remained for many years, all the time officiating in his vernacular German, it being the language of the pulpit and his household.

We next meet with the subject of our narrative in Charleston, S. C. His official engagement with the Lutheran church there begins with the year 1776. Although invited at that date to assume the regular pastoral charge, it is probable that he with a portion of his original flock had removed thither at an earlier period. This was his last field of labor. Many reminiscences of his life and services, his sacrifices and toils, during this eventful period of our country's history, are still preserved. The old church, in which he preached, is still remembered, an antiquated building of a peculiar construction, resembling some of the ancient churches in the rural districts of Germany. The American Revolution interrupted the peaceful course of his ministry, and exposed him to various annoyances and severe trials. His love for liberty, his naturally ardent temperament, led him to espouse the cause of the American colonies with great zeal and patriotic devotion. His congregation, composed entirely of Germans, during the whole conflict identified themselves thoroughly in interest with their Pastor, and were the strenuous advocates and heroic defenders of their adopted country. The *German Fusilier Company*, composed also of members of this church, participated in the dangers, the struggles, and the sufferings of the War. They bore a conspicuous part in the military history of the South, and rendered very important service. Their Captain fell at the siege of

Savannah. Mr. Martin had three sons in the engagement, but they escaped without injury.

When the British, under General Prevost, in May, 1779, made their first advance on Charleston, Mr. Martin had his home on a small farm, at that time about a mile outside of the city limits. In the panic which prevailed, it was feared that his dwelling might furnish a cover to the enemy's approach. In anticipation of such a result, the building was burned by the military authorities, with the prompt and cordial assent of the patriotic pastor. No assault was, however, made upon the city. The sickness of the enemy's troops and the rapid appearance of the American army compelled Prevost to retire. When the crisis was over, and all danger seemed removed, the minister's house was rebuilt, and he resumed his quiet life and regular duties. But the respite did not continue very long. The peace which he enjoyed was only temporary. A second expedition of land and naval forces, under the direction of Sir Henry Clinton, in the spring of 1780, approached the city. Mr. Martin's house, which was just beyond the line of our defensive works, was the second time burned by our own troops. To this the good man cheerfully submitted, although he received no compensation for the loss which he sustained.

Mr. Martin, on the surrender of Charleston to the British, at first, suffered no interruption in his pastoral work. His church continued open, and his congregation worshiped God without fear or molestation. The fact that the exercises were conducted in German, rendered his political position less conspicuous and more secure than that of his brethren who preached in the English language. The Hessian troops, who formed a part of the British force, were, however, sometimes sent by the military power, to attend his services and to mark his expressions. It was soon ascertained that his ministrations were not favorable to the royal cause. He was quickly informed, that he must, in the services of the sanctuary, pray for the King of England. This he resolutely refused to do. Conscientious in the course he had adopted, he was willing to forfeit everything he possessed, even life itself, rather than surrender a principle. The result was that his Church was closed, and his pulpit labors interdicted, during the occupation of the city by the enemy. He was not even allowed to enter his church. For a time he was put under

arrest, being confined to his house, and a guard placed over him. Subsequently his property was confiscated and he was driven from the city.* He remained in the interior of the State, until the close of the War, when he returned, and his farm was restored to him. He rejoiced in the success of the American arms, that the principles, involved in the contest, were recognized and adopted, and that the country he so well loved, after a long and painful strife, free, happy and honored, was entering upon a new career of growth, prosperity and usefulness.

Although aged and having lost his former physical vigor, his congregation still clung to him with warm affection. They urged him on his return in 1783, to resume his pastoral relations until a stated minister could be procured for them from Germany. He consented to this arrangement, and continued his labors, till the arrival of his successor, Rev. John C. Faber, in 1787, when he was released from further service with a vote of thanks from the Church for the fidelity, with which he had ministered to their spiritual interests. He lived several years, after his withdrawal from the active duties of the ministry, on the little farm with which there were so many associations connected. But his physical, as well as his mental, powers gradually failed him, and he closed his honored and useful life, July 27th, 1795, illustrating in his death the principles which he advocated through a long life.

* During the absence of Mr. Martin, Rev. F. Daser, who had been Pastor as early as 1771, and who was required, on entering upon his duties, to "promise that he would be faithful, industrious and conscientious in his walk and conversation, and to serve his flock as a faithful shepherd," and Rev. Christian Streit, who had served as a Chaplain in the American army, and was also taken as a prisoner by the British, officiated in the Lutheran Church. The official records, we find, are signed during this period, either by one or the other, and sometimes by both. Rev. J. C. Faber continued Pastor from 1787 till 1805. He was succeeded by his brother Rev. Charles Faber, who died of yellow fever, in 1811. Temporary supplies from other denominations were obtained till 1814, when the Rev. John Bachman, (now D. D. & LL. D.,) received and accepted a call from the church, on the recommendation of Rev. Drs. Quitman and Mayer. Now almost an octagenarian, he has labored for more than half a century, the faithful, loved and honored Pastor, in this interesting and important field of labor.

From all that we can gather with regard to the character of Mr. Martin, we infer that he was a very pious man, thoroughly honest, faithfully devoted to his work, and exceedingly useful as a minister of the gospel. Among his most prominent traits of character, was a rigid conscientiousness, an unswerving integrity, that no considerations of personal interest or expediency could carry away from the straight line of duty. He was a man of great decision and courage, firm and persistent in the maintenance of his principles, with an energy of will, and a zeal which no discouragement could repress, and no failure abate. In the vindication of what he believed to be the truth, he was prepared for any emergency. Nothing could stand in the path of his purpose. His energies increased with every demand that was made upon them, and his spirit rose buoyant, as those around him often became more despondent. In his family government, some thought that he was too stern, and somewhat severe, but his children, although they stood in awe of him, and reverently regarded his authority, were very devoted to him, for he was kind and considerate, and never unmindful of the amenities and benefactions, that belong to the household. In the church he, also, maintained a rigid discipline. His decisions carried with them great influence. His presence and assistance were often invoked in the adjustment of family difficulties, and of secular disputes, when all other means of reconciliation had failed. The result was generally successful. He formed his own opinions, and acted on his own convictions. The people appreciated his sagacity, and relied on his clear, practical judgment. He fully identified himself with their interests: he steadfastly devoted himself to their moral elevation. He was to them a father; the old rejoiced in him as a friend, and the children looked upon him as a parent. In his private character he was a man of warm sympathies and generous heart, of a fervid disposition, of great depth of feeling, and this intensity of his nature was seen in his deep-toned, simple-hearted piety, and also in his preaching, which was characterized by a high degree of animation and unction. It was the constant burden of his heart, and the earnest purpose of his life, to honor Christ in the salvation of souls. In his early youth he had been trained to habits of industry and thorough mental discipline, and to those sound religious principles which imparted so much strength and

energy to his character, in maturer years. His simplicity and meekness, his sincerity and faithfulness, were the fruits of his pure, earnest faith. Such a man is a blessing in any community, and his death, a public calamity.

LXXIV,

PAUL HENKEL.

Few men in our Church exercised a wider influence in his day, or left a deeper impression upon those with whom he was brought in contact, than Paul Henkel. His name is closely connected with our past history, and his memory is still regarded, in many parts of the land, with grateful interest.

His paternal ancestor, Rev. Gerhard Henkel, immigrated to this country at a very early period. He had served, for a season, as Chaplain in the University of Frankfort, and was subsequently appointed Court Preacher. In one of his discourses, however, the earnestness, with which he presented the truth, greatly offended his sovereign. For the purpose of escaping additional difficulties he immediately resigned his position, and came to this country. This was in the year 1740. He settled in Germantown, Pa., where he assisted in the erection of a Lutheran church, which he did not live to see completed, as he died soon after his arrival. Every succeeding generation in the family furnished its representatives for the ranks of the Christian ministry.

The subject of our sketch, was the oldest son of Jacob, and a great grandson of Gerhard, Henkel. He was born December 15th, 1754, in Rowan county, N. C. His parents were pious. They believed in the covenant obligations, which rested upon them, to train their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Paul was in infancy dedicated to God in Christian baptism, and early instructed in the plan of salvation. He was reared in troublous times. Whilst yet a youth, he, with his father's family, and other families in the neighborhood, was compelled to seek refuge in the mountains of Western Virginia, in consequence of a sanguinary war, waged by the Catawba Indians against the white population of that country. Here, for a time, they lived in forts and blockhouses, guarding themselves as well as they could, from the cruel attacks of

savage hostility. Under these influences, the young man, often performing the arduous and perilous duties of a sentinel or spy, became familiar with scenes of hardship, and accustomed to the use of the rifle. The discipline, through which he passed at this period, more successfully fitted him for subsequent duties.

In 1776, the preaching of Whitefield and Wesley attracted much attention, and excited the deepest interest throughout the country. To his recollections of these times, Mr. Henkel often referred. It was, at this season, that he, with his brother Moses, was awakened to serious reflection, and led to make the subject of religion a personal concern. Ultimately they were both brought, not only to a full conviction of the truth, but to a practical and cordial acceptance of it. One of the first ideas, with which they were impressed, was, that they must become ministers of the gospel. Moses entered the Methodist Church, and became quite a prominent preacher in that communion. Paul, thinking that a more extensive course of theological training was required, commenced a course of study, with a view to the Lutheran ministry, under the direction of Pastor Krueh, of Frederick, Md. Here he acquired a knowledge of the Latin and Greek, and other branches of learning; and with great diligence pursued his theological studies. He was examined as a candidate for the sacred office and licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at that time the only Lutheran Synod in this country. In 1792 he was permanently invested with the ministerial office, the ordination services being performed by Rev. John Frederick Schmidt, of Philadelphia.

His first field of labor was New Market, Virginia. Having received a call from several vacant congregations in that section of the country, he felt it his duty to settle there. But his labors were not confined to that region. They were extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton and Wythe counties, in all of which he laid the foundation of churches. He occupied very much the position of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together our scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacraments. After having labored for many years among the people, to whom he was first introduced, he removed to Staunton, Augusta county, taking charge of several congregations, but after a service of three years at this point, he resumed his labors among his former people.

In 1800, he received and accepted a call to Rowan, his native county in North Carolina. But here, as in Virginia, his duties were not restricted to his immediate charge. The care of our Lutheran population, wherever there was no provision for its wants, claimed his attention, and all the time, that could be spared from his own people, was faithfully devoted to the interests of our Church in the surrounding country. During his residence in North Carolina, he cultivated the most intimate and friendly relations with the Moravians, who had a flourishing settlement at Salem. He interchanged visits with them, and frequently officiated in their pulpits.

The location in Rowan being unfavorable to health, and his family being frequently afflicted with fever and ague, he relinquished this field of labor in 1805, and returned again to New Market, but he was not disposed to confine his labors to any one particular charge, although invitations to desirable localities were extended to him. He preferred laboring as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were needed, and building up the Church in destitute regions, not depending for his support upon any missionary fund, but upon the good will of the people he served. He made repeated tours through Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana and Ohio, encouraging our people, and, when practicable, organizing them into congregations. During the War of 1812, he removed to Point Pleasant, Mason county, Va. Here he continued to labor on, and formed several Lutheran churches. He remained until the close of the War, when, with his family he returned to his old home at New Market, and resumed his missionary work.

In 1803, whilst a resident of Rowan, he, with several of his brethren belonging to the Synod of Pennsylvania, united in the formation of the Synod of North Carolina. At a later period he also assisted in the organization of the Ohio Synod. He subsequently met with this body, and was recognized as one of its members. He seemed deeply interested in the enlargement and prosperity of the Church, and was always ready to contribute to its progress and success.

He published several volumes which, for that period in our Church, had a wide circulation. In 1809, he wrote a work in the German language, which he afterwards trans-

lated into English, on the subject of Christian Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Part of the work is devoted to the defence of Infant Baptism and the Mode of Sprinkling in preference to that of Immersion. The discussion is of a popular character, adapted to the capacity of the common reader, and was, in its day, deemed highly useful. In 1810, he issued a German Hymn Book, and in 1816, one in English, a portion of the Hymns being arranged for the Gospels and Epistles of the Ecclesiastical Year. Many of the Hymns, both German and English, are his own composition. In 1811, he published his German, and soon after his English, Catechism, making no changes in the substance of Luther's, but only reducing the longer to shorter questions, in order that they might be more easily understood and committed to memory by the learner. As he very much favored the observance of the Church festivals, commemorative of the great facts in the history of redemption, he appended to the Catechisms an explanation of these occasions. He was very regular and faithful in his catechetical instructions. In his theological views he adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of the Church. He was opposed to removing the old landmarks. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations, made by Melancthon, in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period of his life, his doctrinal position was the unaltered Confession. With great zeal he advocated the cordial adoption of this venerable symbol, and he had the twenty-one doctrinal articles published in pamphlet form for the edification of the Church. He also published a small German work in rhyme, entitled *Zeitvertreib* (*Past-Time*), the design of which was, in satirical invective to rebuke fanaticism, and superstition, the follies and vices of the times. His irony, or sarcasm, was, sometimes, very keen and withering.

Mr. Henkel possessed a clear, well-balanced and vigorous mind. It was original, quick and comprehensive. As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. His discourses were able and instructive. In the commencement of his sermon he was slow and often tedious, but, as he proceeded, he became animated and eloquent, his thoughts were appropriate and his language fluent. His style was always simple and natural, and his illustrations forcible. The people heard him gladly, with marked attention, and his opinions always carried with them great

weight. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Church.

He was a man of untiring industry, of a perseverance that never yielded to any obstacle that was not absolutely insuperable, of an unwearied application that never evaded any service required by fidelity to duty. Although his health was not good, he was always employed, assiduously engaged from day to day, in reading, writing, preaching, often, too, laboring with his own hands. Without complaint, or regret, he was ready to toil and make sacrifices, that he might accomplish the object of his ministry, and "finish his course with joy."

In private life Mr. Henkel was genial, kind and considerate. He possessed great equanimity of temper. He was affable and communicative. His conversation was entertaining and impressive, full of interesting incident and pertinent anecdote. He was regarded with warm affection and cordial confidence. His friendships were sincere and constant, his friends numerous and devoted. They fondly loved and fully trusted him. One of his most prominent traits was a sterling integrity that never suffered him to relax from his convictions of truth, or duty. He was not the man to be swerved from his purpose by policy or adverse opinions. He had much self-reliance, and independence of character. He was distinguished for his consistency. His piety was not fluctuating and superficial, but steadfast and reliable. His deportment was correct and well ordered. His habits of life were plain and simple. He was opposed to extravagance, to everything like ostentation or demonstration, yet in the discharge of his official duties he was always dignified, and when ministering in the sanctuary he invariably wore his clerical robes, made of rich black silk.

In person Mr. Henkel was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. He had a keen black eye, and black hair. His physical organs were all well developed. His walk was rapid and his carriage stately. He was erect as an Indian, somewhat inclined to corpulency, yet athletic and quick in his movements. His fine appearance and expressive countenance usually attracted attention.

In 1776 he was united in marriage to Elizabeth Negley, who with her father's family had emigrated from New Jer-

sey to Western Virginia. He was the father of nine children, six sons and three daughters. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church, the eldest entered the medical profession.

Mr. Henkel had long stood as a sentinel upon the watch tower. But his health gradually failed him. He was, towards the close of his life, attacked with paralysis, which rendered him almost helpless. Resting, however, on the promises of the gospel which he had, for many years, presented to others, he cheerfully submitted to the dispensation. On the 17th of November, 1825, in the 71st year of his age, he was released from his sufferings. The Master called him from his labors to his reward. His body, so long the temple of the Holy Ghost, was gently laid to rest in front of the Lutheran church at New Market, where it will await the resurrection of the just.

LXXV.

JACOB WINGARD.

The Lutheran Church, in the death of Jacob Wingard, of South Carolina, lost one of her most faithful and promising sons. In his 29th year, almost at the very beginning of his useful career, when the Church seemed so much to require his services, he was stricken down. But the Head of the Church is the light and defence of the Church. He will take care of its interests. Whatever is ordered by Him is wise and good. Although his ways are often inscrutable, beyond human comprehension, He will yet make them all plain and hereafter clearly interpret his providences. It is our duty to be calmly submissive to the Divine will, although our expectations may be disappointed, our plans thwarted and our wishes all frustrated.

The subject of the present sketch was a native of Lexington District, S. C., and was born on the 2nd of December, 1802. Brought up on his father's farm, he received in his youth the ordinary instruction in the rudiments of an education, such as was then common in a country school, but at that early period he showed an aptitude for learning, and was distinguished for his success in study. His youth was marked by a freedom from all immoral tendencies, and a love for that which was pure and lovely and

of good report. He had no fondness for the amusements, in which his comrades generally participated. His enjoyments were derived from other sources, his aspirations were higher and nobler. He seemed unusually mature for one of his years. In the character of his mind and heart there were indications of something more than ordinary. His gentle, affable maners, and his serious and correct deportment, made him the favorite of the whole community.

It was not, however, until he reached his twentieth year that he became interested in the subject of religion as a personal matter. Deeply impressed by the truths of God's word, his convictions were deep and pungent. This greatly surprised his more intimate friends, who were accustomed, in the consistent and exemplary character which he daily exhibited, to look upon him as a model of every thing that was good. But no one could have felt more intensely than he did his personal unworthiness, his great guilt in the sight of heaven, and only, when he was brought to rely solely on the merits of his Saviour, did he find peace for his soul.

After Mr. Wingard had fully and unreservedly consecrated himself to the Lord, one of the first ideas that filled his mind was, that he must become a minister of the Gospel and labor for the extension of Christ's kingdom. But then the ministry seemed too sacred for one so sinful and unworthy as he regarded himself. For a long time his mind was in a state of anxious solicitude, of deep suspense. There was the careful inquiry, the inward conflict. He was desirous of ascertaining the path of duty. His earnest prayer was, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" Speedily his doubts vanished, his difficulties yielded. He felt that he was called by the Master to labor in his vineyard, in the ministry of reconciliation, and with his new and spiritual view of Christianity he entered upon this purpose with all the vigor and strength of his soul.

After a course of three years' study, under the direction of his Pastor, he was in the year 1825, licensed to preach the gospel by the Synod of South Carolina. Having received and accepted a call to the pastoral work, he at once commenced his labors in the Lexington District, making Sandy Run his principal preaching place. With the most exalted views of the ministry, he earnestly and actively engaged in its duties, and very soon took position as one of the most popular preachers of the day. His efforts

were greatly blessed. Many seals were given to his ministry. He continued to labor in this field for nearly four years with great acceptance and fidelity. He was fond of books and interested in study. By assiduous application he had made some progress in classical and sacred literature, notwithstanding the disadvantages which environed his path. But he desired increased facilities for the acquisition of knowledge. As his physical constitution was naturally feeble and his health, by close confinement and constant attention to duty, had become impaired, a respite from labor was deemed necessary, and he concluded to go to Gettysburg, Pa., with a view of continuing his studies in the Theological Seminary, and under the impression that a change of climate would be beneficial to his health. This was in the autumn of 1829. He remained in Gettysburg about a year, but his physical powers became very much prostrated. During the year he had a very severe attack of fever, from the effects of which he never recovered. Early in September of 1830, he returned to the South, accompanied by his friend, the Rev David Jacobs, at the time an instructor in the *Gettysburg Gymnasium*, who was himself in search of health.* The journey was long and irksome, attended with many trials and discouragements. They were nearly three weeks on the way. The stage-coach was twice upset, and once precipitated over the abutment of a high bridge. Mr. Wingard had one of his arms fractured, and his condition, owing to the delicate state of his system, was for some time considered precarious. The following November, although pale, wan and broken in health, he thought he was sufficiently strong to attend the annual meeting of the Synod of South Carolina, when he was permanently invested with the sacred office.†

* Mr. Jacobs never returned. On his journey homeward he was so much indisposed, that he was compelled to take his bed and call in a physician, at Shepherdstown, Va. He died November 4th, 1830, in advance of his friend, Mr. Wingard, only a few months. *Idæ*, sketch of Rev. D. Jacobs, *Evangelical Review*, Vol. VII. p. 800.

† At an earlier period in our history, as a Church, in this country, the Licentiate System, as it is called, was adopted by all the Synods. A candidate, after he was licensed to preach, was often continued on probation, three or four years, before he received ordination, although the act conferred no additional powers. In some parts of our Church the system has been altogether abandoned for what

He returned to his father's home, but his work on earth was then nearly completed. His enfeebled health rapidly declined. The most unfavorable symptoms were developed. Insidious and unrelenting disease had taken hold of his system, and wasting consumption marked him as its victim. He felt that his days were numbered, but he was perfectly resigned, calm and composed in prospect of death. As he approached the grave, his utterances were those of assured hope and faith, telling that the victory was won. "The clouds," he says, "begin gradually to disperse and the sun to shine with all its brightness into my soul. He adds, "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand." "My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever." "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, who giveth me the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." He rested on the promises of the Gospel. The appropriate and familiar language of Scripture was continually on his lips. The Saviour was the only ground of his hope, the constant theme of his conversation. To his friends who surrounded his dying couch, he said, "I am happy." "Blessed be God! I am so happy." Thus he continued to discourse as long as he could speak, till his released spirit left its wasted body and rose to its rest in the presence of the Redeemer. Even in death his countenance was irradiated with a heavenly smile; the triumphs of Christian faith were displayed, and the power of religion in the soul magnified. Surrounded by loving hearts, he died January 13th, 1831, and, amid a concourse of devoted friends, was interred in the cemetery of St. Michael's Church with appropriate services, conducted by Dr. Strobel, and Rev. Messrs. Scheck, Rawl and Dreher.

In person Mr. Wingard is said to have been somewhat below the medium size, of a delicate formation with strongly marked features, an aquiline nose and projecting chin, of a dark complexion with black hair and dark eyes. His countenance was intellectual and, when roused to action, very animated.

seems the more scriptural mode of investing an individual with the sacred office, so soon as the Church has given him a call. Probation should rather precede than succeed the candidate's introduction into the ministry.

He was regarded as a man of more than usual promise, a minister of peculiar gifts and graces. He was a good preacher, exceedingly solemn and tender. There was something very attractive in his manner. His sermons were characterized by naturalness and simplicity, yet by great pathos, depth and strength of fervor. "His preaching was always extemporaneous," says Dr. Strobel, "and his voice, although not very loud, was uncommonly sweet, and its tones vibrated upon the ear like the soft strains of a flute." So earnest and impressive was he, that he left upon the minds of his hearers the conviction, that he preached not himself, that he was filled with zeal for his Master's glory and love for the souls of men. The simple truths of the gospel were the burden of all his preaching.

His piety was of a high type. His heart glowed with love to Christ and his cause. A marked feature of his religious life was his deep consciousness of the evil of sin and of his utter unworthiness before God. Evangelical in spirit, exemplary in conduct, faithful in the discharge of duty, his conservative influence was felt by all who came within its power.

In his pastoral work he was active and earnest. Although warmly attached to the Church of his fathers, he sympathized very much with our Methodist brethren in their measures to promote the interests of Christ's cause. He was the friend and advocate of protracted meetings, and of the use of special efforts for revivals of religion. The ruling passion of his soul was to lead sinners from the error of their ways and to save the perishing from eternal death. In his habits of thought and feeling his sympathies were strongly with the people. For their improvement he faithfully labored, and he was eminently successful, not only in the conversion of immortal souls, but in guiding inquirer, and in conducting the people of God to higher attainments in piety.

LXXVI.

AARON JACOB KARN.

The subject of the present sketch we met, for the first time, in the autumn of 1837, the year before we left College. He had just entered the Institution, a young man

of eighteen, with a healthful appearance and a bright, intelligent countenance, and, although he had, as yet, enjoyed few opportunities for mental culture, he was full of ardor, and entered with great zest upon the work before him. On our return to *Alma Mater*, in 1839, we renewed our acquaintance. He was then a member of the Sophomore class, engaged in the successful prosecution of his studies. In the discharge of our official duties, we were frequently brought in contact, but never in conflict, with him. We always found him frank and courteous, pleasant and engaging in his manners. We enjoyed many proofs of his friendship and confidence. After his introduction into the Christian ministry we met occasionally in ecclesiastical convention. He was a delegate from the Synod of South Carolina to the conventions of the General Synod, at Reading in 1857, and at Pittsburg in 1859. He seemed to have lost none of his former vivacity, his genial disposition and confiding nature. At Reading we heard him preach, the first and only time. The subject was the "Syrophenecian Woman." It was a carefully prepared discourse, evangelical and instructive, and made a very favorable impression. He presented the truth with great simplicity and directness. His words, manner, matter, tones of voice and attitude, were in keeping with the service he was rendering to God. The last time he visited Gettysburg was in 1858, the occasion of our *Annual Commencement*. He was present at the meeting of the *Alumni Association*, and participated in its proceedings. He closed the exercises with fervent prayer for God's blessing upon his *Alma Mater*. He came to our home, and with a heart full of love and zeal, pleaded for the interests of our Southern Zion. With a kind partiality altogether undeserved, he seemed to think that our services were needed in connection with the youthful College, just established, at Newberry, S. C. In his judgment, and in that of others whom he had consulted, this was our mission, and it was our duty to consent to occupy this inviting field of usefulness. We listened with deference to his arguments; we were deeply touched by the warmth and eloquence, with which he presented the cause, and if we had, at the time, allowed our feelings to determine the question, we would at once have yielded to his wishes. But after a serious and careful consideration of the subject, we felt that it was our duty to de-

cline the request. From events that subsequently transpired, we believe that a kind Providence ordered our decision. This was the last extended conversation, or correspondence, with our worthy and beloved brother.

Aaron J. Karn was born in Loudon county, Virginia, August, 1820. Early in life he dedicated himself to the service of the Lord, and became deeply impressed with the conviction, that it was his duty to prepare for the ministry of reconciliation. Established in the faith of Jesus, and giving, in a correct and consistent life, evidence of the sincerity of his profession, he left home for Gettysburg, in the fall of 1837, and entered the Preparatory Department of Pennsylvania College. He finished his course in College in 1842, and was graduated with an Historical Oration on the "Moors in Spain," as his *Commencement* exercise. On the completion of his Theological studies in the Theological Seminary, he was licensed to preach, and accepted a call to Pinegrove, Schuylkill county, Pa. In the summer of 1845, he commenced his pastoral labors, at Canton, Ohio. Here he remained for three years, when he resigned, in order to take charge of our Lutheran interests in Savannah, Georgia. In this position he faithfully labored, enjoying the confidence of his people, and of the whole community, until his physical strength gave way, and advancing disease compelled him to suspend the exercise of his office. His congregation, so devoted to him, thought a trip to foreign lands might be of value to him in restoring his impaired health. They provided the expenses for the journey; they secured supplies for the pulpit during his absence. He sailed for Europe, and traveled through France, Italy, Germany and Switzerland, but deriving no advantage from the tour, he fondly turned his eyes to his native country, which, in the providence of God, he was permitted to reach, only to spend his last days among loved ones, and to close his life, cheered by the tender sympathies of kind friends whom he cherished with so much affection. His decline was very rapid. Sensible of his approaching end, his mind was serene and entirely submissive. Nothing could be more sincere, animating and delightful than the confidence which he evinced in the Lord Jesus Christ. He felt that he was a sinner saved by grace, and that God, his Saviour, would not forsake him. Rev. Mr. Pratt, of the Episcopal Church, who was with him in his last hours, speaks of "his sure hope and tri-

triumphant death." He peacefully passed through the conflict, and in the trying hour gave evidence of the strength of his faith and the fulness of his patience. He expired at the Richmond House, Chicago, December 19th, 1860, and slept in Jesus. Stricken down in the vigor of manhood, in the meridian of life, his death, so premature to the Church, was the realization of all that was dearest to his heart, and to his pure and sanctified aspirations.

His remains were conveyed from Chicago to Massillon, Ohio, to be buried with kindred dust. Before their departure, there were religious exercises at the Richmond House, conducted by Rev. G. A. Bowers of the Lutheran, and Rev. Messrs. Clarkson (an old College friend,) and Pratt of the Episcopal Church. On their arrival at Massillon, before they were consigned to the tomb, services were held in the Episcopal church, conducted by Rev. Mr. Morrell, the Pastor, and Rev. Messrs. D. Garver and J. J. Fast, of our own Church. Mr. Garver preached a sermon from the words, "And Aaron died there on top of the mountain," in which he exhibited the elevating influence of faith and hope in Christ, in prospect of approaching dissolution.

Mr. Karn was, in 1849, united in marriage to Lucy M. Hawk. His wife and two children preceded him into the eternal world. A daughter, an interesting little girl, survived him, who was left in the care of her uncle, Samuel C. Hawk, of Chicago.

The subject of our narrative was a faithful watchman in the service of his Master. His heart was in tender sympathy with his flock. He never deserted them in affliction, or in the time of danger. During the prevalence of the Yellow Fever in Savannah, in 1854 and 1858, he continued at his post, exhausting his time and his strength, ministering to the sick and the dying, not only of his own congregation, but to others who were not in church connection. In his attentions he was energetic, active and heroic to all classes, ready to make any sacrifice for the relief and comfort of those who were suffering. The scenes, through which he passed in his kind offices to the sick and the burial of the dead, were most distressing and heart-rending. It is supposed that his physical constitution sustained an injury from the influences of the epidemic, which was permanent.

He was considered an earnest Pastor, steadfastly devoted to the interests of his people. He had the power of at-

tracting to him most strongly and of binding most tenderly to his own, the hearts of warm and loving friends. He was remarkable for being able to gain the confidence of others, so that they could express their feelings without effort, or embarrassment. He possessed those excellencies of character, which invariably secure esteem. His temperament was full of kindness, his heart was true and firm in its attachments. In all the relations of life his conduct was marked by integrity, charity for the failings of others, and benevolence to those who looked to him for advice, sympathy, or aid in affliction. Always accessible, yet unobtrusive, genial yet dignified, he secured, in a high degree, the respect and confidence of his associates. All who came within the range of his influence were impressed with his moral worth and Christian fidelity. During the last years of his life, his character matured rapidly, and developed a marked Christian holiness.

The death of Mr. Karn was an occasion of deep sorrow. His *Church Council*, in the resolutions they adopted, testify to his faithfulness in preaching the Word, and in ministering to the sick, and make special mention of his brave and self-denying services during the seasons of scourging pestilence. The *Morning News*, of Savannah, speaks of him as one "whose purity, benevolence and amiability endeared him to a very large circle of acquaintances and friends, outside of his immediate congregation." The *Lutheran Observer* in an editorial, says: "He was an able preacher and an excellent man. He had the power to win and to retain the affections. His ministry was fruitful in good results, and he will live enshrined in the holiest affections of many precious souls, whom he brought to Christ."

Whilst we are so often reminded that "life is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away," let us be grateful that there are so many illustrations of the power and excellency of Christianity, which can conduct us with honor and usefulness through life, and minister comfort and consolation to us in death. In the midst of our duties, in humble dependence on God, with faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, may we improve the lessons taught us, so that when our labors on earth are ended, we also may have a "title clear" to an inheritance that is imperishable, and that fadeth not away!

ARTICLE V.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By Rev. J. B. GROSS, Easton, Pa.

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."
John 6 : 68.

Introduction.

The dogmas of the Lord's Supper, which have received the sanction of the different branches of the Christian Church, are generally regarded as declarative of a final decision of commentators, on the interesting and important subject, of the *body and blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ. For though the creed of one denomination, is often regarded mere heresy in the eyes of the other, yet all respectively claiming to occupy pre-eminently the only true stand-point in the Church, boldly, perhaps, now and then, *presumptuously*, enunciate the behest, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther!" Every attempt, therefore, to throw new light upon this perplexed subject, or to define and illustrate it, in a manner which may be deemed at variance with established belief—often, to besure, venerable rather in respect to its antiquity, than its strict scriptural truthfulness—must be pronounced by some, at least, not only as vain, but even as presumptuous. I readily admit that the opinions of men, whose piety and learning have given them a title to be teachers, not masters, in Israel, deserve and generally receive, the homage which is due to superior attainments; yet, we are told, "To err is human," an axiom which accounts for the fact, that human dogmas are not always exempt from fallacy, nor consequently the results of human investigations above a well-founded distrust, or suspicion. Hence, blindly, or servilely to follow the dictates of others, is as wrong, nay sinful, as it is dangerous and disreputable. Besides, the apostolic injunction, "To prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good," is quite as binding upon us, as upon our predecessors; and, therefore, the Lord's Supper is a theme legitimately open, in every age, to an honest inquiry, or a candid discussion.

The very fact, that amongst the leading theologians, both before and after the Reformation, the most striking diversity of opinion has been entertained, relative to the design and meaning of this Christian institution, clearly warrants the attempt of a renewed and careful investigation of the subject. Thus, one pronounces it to be a sin-offering; another, the mere sign, or symbol of such an offering. This one boldly asserts, that by the act of consecration, the bread and wine are converted into the real body and blood of our Lord; while that one, no less boldly, affirms the real presence to exist, but *in, with, and under*, the same sacramental elements. Again, a mystical presence, and a spiritual manducation, are taught confidently, as the only sound and tenable exegesis, of which the subject is susceptible. "No, no," says another, "it receives its proper, *hermeneutically* correct, interpretation and divine sanction, only in so far as a purely moral influence is predicated, as the end and bearing of its institution." "You are all in sad and dangerous error, and evidently ignorant of the first principles of Christianity," cries a third, "for the Lord's Supper is simply *meat and drink for babes in Christ*, and entirely superseded by the inward light, with which the soul of the more advanced and mature Christian is divinely and savingly illumined." From this, it will be perceived, to what an extent Protestants are arrayed, and justly too, against Roman Catholics, and how strikingly one denomination, of the former, differs eucharistically, from another, or assumes a hostile attitude against dissentients generally. Where so many discordant and often *clashing* opinions prevail, and this too, in respect to a single evangelical question, all may be more or less erroneous, and some of them even false. One thing, at least, is certain, that all *cannot* be true, and that some, if true, would alike contradict common sense, as well as the plainest teachings of the religion of Jesus Christ, and, therefore, *ought not to be true*. All mutually charge each other with unsound views, and each, with as charitable frame of mind as is possible, where zeal may predominate over knowledge, feels constrained to recognize a heretic, or imbecile in every one but himself. Under such circumstances, sincerely and deeply to be regretted, it must be evident, that to advance any new theory on this much controverted and most weighty subject, fraught, as it should seem, more or less, with so many and grave difficulties, is likely to be met

by those whose judgments are warped, either by education, or a spirit of faction, on behalf of a favorite *shibboleth*, with frowns, perhaps sneers and contempt. However much as I may have to apprehend from ignorance or prejudice, potent champions in blind partyism, I shall, notwithstanding, indulge the hope of being, in some degree, instrumental in exhibiting in a new light, and its true sense, the nature and design of the Lord's Supper. While, therefore, I respectfully submit this treatise to the unbiased judgment and candid decision of the conscientious searchers after truth, of whatever name or creed they may be, I confidently look forward to an ultimate and just verdict from man, man in his independent integrity, and because seeking but to comprehend and disseminate the truth as it is in Jesus, the gracious approval of God.

The Exodus of the Hebrews, or the Tenth and last Miracle.

The intimate connection in which the Jewish passover and the Lord's Supper stand to each other, and the light which the former must necessarily throw upon an attempt correctly to interpret the latter, make it desirable first, to treat of the Old Testament institution, before its correlate or counterpart, in the New Testament, is made the subject of investigation.

It is in chapter XII of the 2 Book of Moses, that the very extraordinary history of the institution of the remarkable and interesting anniversary festival of the Jewish church—the passover, called also the Lord's passover—is recorded. Its name, I may state, is derived from the Hebrew *pasahh*, which, according to Gesenius, signifies to *pass over*, to *pass through*, to *pass by and spare*, or simply, to *spare*, in allusion to that awful judgment of Jehovah, in consequence of which, Egypt's first born, both of man and beast, was singled out as the unfortunate victim of his retributive justice, while that of the Hebrews, was spared or passed over, by the *destroying* angel. In vain, until now, has been wrought a series of the most stupendous miracles, to impress the minds of the haughty Egyptians with a lively and powerful conviction of the profound and abiding interest, which the God of Jacob took in the welfare of his oppressed and despised, but chosen, people, and to move, if possible, the obdurate heart of their proud and defiant monarch, to consent to their immediate departure from his inhospitable dominions, and, consequently,

to a final and absolute redemption from their long and miserable servitude. No sooner had the vacillating tyrant of the Nile, acknowledged the hand of the Omnipotent, in the astounding events, that, with a rapidity as remarkable as it was appalling, transpired in his trembling presence, and signified his willingness to comply with his demands, at once, so just and reasonable, yet, at the same time, so hard and impossible to resist, when suddenly forgetting, or disregarding, his past alarms and the perplexing straits, into which his sullen obstinacy had so often, and so deservedly plunged him, and not thinking, that under such unfavorable circumstances, to hold out any longer against the repeatedly declared will of heaven must inevitably involve him in still greater and more merited calamities, and, eventually, even endanger the stability of his throne, he evinced the vanity of insulted pride, and suppressing, for the moment, the rising emotions of fear and shame, again assumed a hostile attitude, and boldly bid defiance to the King of kings. Once more, the famed land of the Pharaohs and of the pyramids, the loved home of Osiris and Isis, the puissant divinities of a mythic creed, was to be the scene of a tragedy, at once appalling and calculated, while it subdued the mind of the most stubborn, to humble into the dust, the sceptered greatness of this world. The first-born offspring, from the king on his lofty throne, to the lowly peasant at the plow,* from the fiery steed, to the gentle sheep, &c., was to be destroyed, on the ever memorable night of the fourteenth of the month *Nisan*, corresponding, according to some chronologists, to March, and according to others, to April or May, in the year before Christ, one thousand four hundred and ninety-one. That the first-born of the Hebrews might not share the summary and inevitable fate that awaited that of their unfeeling and perfidious oppressors, the unhappy posterity of Abraham were directed to stain the lintels and posts of the door-ways of their houses, with the blood of the lamb, which every family, or household among them was ordered to kill on the eventful occasion, that the Lord, or the destroying angel, in passing through the guilty land, ripe

* By the phrase, *lowly peasant*, I do not mean a *farmer*, in the acceptation of the term in the United States, but a *dependent* cultivator of the soil. That one is a *freeman*, this a *serf*. I honor the former, the latter I pity.

for the impending retribution, to smite the doomed victims of their relentless task-masters, might, humanly speaking, recognize their habitations, by those conspicuous crimson badges, and not confound the innocent with the guilty. At length, the tenth, the last, and the most terrific of all the renowned *plagues of Egypt*, completed the humiliation of the arrogant and powerful Egyptians, and prepared the minds of those inveterate enemies of the Hebrew race, the despised shepherds and abused strangers, to come to terms, at once, speedily and finally. Sensible that longer resistance would be futile, if not utterly ruinous; deploring the sad state of the country, already tottering upon the verge of dissolution; rendered irresolute by schemes, more than once frustrated, and hopes as often disappointed; while agitated by apprehensions for the future, and ashamed of the past, which he had hitherto acted in the national drama, the "king that knew not Joseph, rose up in the night," and sending for Moses and Aaron—the one, the future law-giver, the other, the first high-priest, of the liberated nation, and at once the representatives of their people, and the vicegerents of their God, and bid them "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel, and go serve the Lord, as ye have said, &c." Ex. 12 : 30—32. Simultaneously with the emancipation of the Hebrews from the evils and the wrongs of a grievous bondage, commenced the era of their national elevation and political importance; their remarkable civil and religious institutions; their spiritual regeneration, and moral pre-eminence. Soon after this period, date too, many of those religious ceremonies and sacrificial rites, which, under certain conditions, were not only to possess expiatory efficacy, but be also at the same time, *emblematical* of a future; a more comprehensive, and a more excellent expiation—the *redemption* through Jesus Christ.

The Jewish Passover, in its Original and in its Modified Form.

First, in its original form. It has already been stated, that the history of the institution of the annual festival of the Jews, known as the Passover, is recorded in the XII chapter of the Book of Exodus; it is reiterated in the IX chapter of the Book of Numbers, both as to its obligatory nature, and the mode of its observance. Originally, it ap-

pears to have been celebrated with comparatively few rites, and to have consisted in only a small number of *festal elements*. The lamb, or rather its flesh, the unleavened bread, cakes, and the bitter herbs, are the substances, according to the text, which composed the essential ingredients of the festive board, of the primitive Passover, as it was celebrated in Egypt. They will receive farther explanation, by a reference to the original Hebrew. The lamb—*seh*: “One of the smaller cattle, a sheep or goat.” Custom, as far as can be ascertained, among the Jews, in the subsequent period of the Church, decides in favor of the young of the sheep—the *lamb*, though the Hebrew term equally admits a rendering into the young of the goat—the *kid*. The unleavened bread, *matzah* :* “Something unleavened; pressed together; close, heavy; in opposition to what is leavened or light.” In the singular, with the adjective, Lev. 8 : 26, it is *hhallath matzath*, unleavened cake, and in the plural, Num. 6 : 15, *hhulloth matzoth*, unleavened cakes. Instead of bread, therefore, cake in the singular, and cakes in the plural, are the proper translations of the Hebrew. Besides the thin cake, of a figure resembling a *soda-cracker*, only larger, still called *matzah*, as it was in remote antiquity, and emphatically the paschal cake, is sufficient proof that *matzah* is cake, and not bread, in the sense in which Occidental nations employ the term. The bitter herbs—*merorim*, *bitter herbs*, used only in the plural.†

A few remarks, relative to the design of the paschal institution, and the manner after which it was celebrated, may here be introduced. The blood of the paschal lamb, was stained, by means of a *bunch of hyssop*, on the lintels and posts of the door-ways of the houses. The object of these designative badges was, that seeing them, “The Lord would pass over the door, and not suffer the destroyer to enter the houses and smite the inhabitants.” The blood of the lamb was, therefore, indirectly of a propitiatory character, it saved. The lamb, after it was dressed, was to be prepared for the table, by being *roasted*, after which it was eaten with the unleavened cakes and bitter herbs. Every *household*, if it was large enough, had a lamb to itself, if not, some neighbors made up the deficiency; for the in-

* The eighteenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *Tsadhe*, is usually, and, perhaps, more properly, represented by *Ts*, instead as here by *Tz*.

† “And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage.” Ex. 1 : 14.

tention was, that nothing should remain. If, however, it so happened that a part of it was left unconsumed, it had to be burned before morning, as was the case with the remains of thank-offerings generally. For, though in the history of the institution of the Passover, our English version of the Bible, speaks of a *sacrifice* indefinitely, the original *zebakh pesakh* denotes the paschal thank-offering: the later customs of the Jews, as we shall see hereafter, clearly verify this construction. The Jews were ever to be only thankful for their wonderful preservation amid the execution of Jehovah's awful judgments upon the Egyptians, and they were, hence, annually to observe the celebration of the Passover: first, as an evidence of undying *gratitude*, and, secondly, as a perpetual *memorial*. These facts are plainly taught in Ex. 12, 14 : 26, 27 verses. In the fourteenth verse, the Lord speaks thus: "And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial*." This day: the fourteenth of the month Nisan, the anniversary of the institution of the Passover. In the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh verses, the additional reason for the observance of the Passover festival, is stated in these words: "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, &c." The Passover festival, therefore, is reminiscent, a memorial. The Jews celebrated it, in remembrance of the first Passover in Egypt. It is a thank-offering festival, or thanksgiving sacrifice; for the *destroyer* had passed over them—salvation had been vouchsafed to them.

Secondly, in its modified form. In this division, relating to the festival of the Passover, we shall find much that will corroborate what has been already said, as well as considerable additional matter, and, therefore, we must expect the Passover both to assume new features, and to be clothed with new interest. I notice first, that according to the ritual usages, common in thank-offerings, among the Jews, the fat of the lamb was burned on the altar, as a sacrifice, or an offering of thanksgiving to the Lord. Before proceeding farther, I desire to avow myself under obligation, in this part of my treatise, to Lundius, the erudite author of the "*Allen Juedischen Heiligthuemer*." Having performed this simple act of justice, I remark, it may be observed that the paschal cakes, the unleavened bread, *were broken*, and then distributed among the guests, because, being hard

and brittle, they could more readily be broken, than divided in any other way ; the breaking of them, however, had no reference to a breaking of any part of the lamb's body ; for not a "bone of it was to be broken." Hence, the custom of breaking the bread, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, cannot be meant, as is commonly supposed, to be an allusion to a breaking of the Saviour's body on the cross, because no part of *his* body was broken. I add, that the Jews were in the habit of calling the roasted flesh of the paschal lamb, *the body of the Passover*: *basar*, according to Gesenius, signifies both body and flesh. It must, therefore, have been common among the Passover guests, to use the word *basar* in this twofold sense ; as the body of the Passover, the flesh of the Passover, &c., meaning the body, or flesh of the lamb, which was merely a symbol of the original Passover lamb, which could not be *eaten*, but only commemorated. Wine, also, was finally introduced into the paschal celebration, and the guests partook freely, though, doubtless, as pious Israelites, moderately of it, using several goblets on this happy, jubilant occasion. What is especially to be commended, and is worthy of the general imitation of mankind, is the profound gratitude with which the Passover festival was observed, or every part of it enjoyed, with souls overflowing with thankfulness and praise. Before the flesh of the lamb, the wine, or the cakes, were used by the participants of the feast, the father of the family, or some one appointed to officiate in his stead, pronounced a suitable blessing, or in other words, solemnly offered up thanks to God, the adorable "giver of every good and perfect gift." Six psalms were *statedly* employed, at the Passover festival, to resound the grateful praises of the devout Jews, and known under the title of *Hallel*-psalms, or psalms of praise. They were designed to express more generally, and at distinct intervals of the feast, the praises and thanksgivings, adapted to the occasion. They comprised the group, beginning with the one hundred and thirteenth, and ending with the one hundred and eighteenth psalms. They were sometimes only read by the celebrant, but generally they were sung in full chorus. To each element, or ingredient of the Passover Supper, a special benediction, or *grace* was appropriated. A few examples of thanksgiving, or praise, pronounced before the cakes, bread, in its widest sense, and wine were distributed, may here be inserted : "Blessed art thou, O

Lord, our God, King of the world! who provides us with bread from the earth." In the case of the wine, the host said: "All thy works, O Lord! do praise thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, King of the world! who hast created the fruit of the vine." Here we find no instance of a conversion, or transmutation of the paschal *elements*: they are simply treated as gifts of God, for which thanks and praises are devoutly offered up. Nor is there a *consecration*. Only thanksgiving, praise, that is all. I shall now proceed to point out the symbolical, or emblematical significations of the paschal elements, or ingredients. The flesh or body of the lamb was a symbol, only a symbol of the Passover lamb. The blood of the lamb, not being used in the festival of the Passover, it being poured at the foot of the altar, wine—red wine, unless it could not be had, was employed to symbolize the blood of the first Passover lamb, stained on the posts and lintels of the door-ways of the Hebrew habitations. Therefore, neither the flesh was the body, nor the wine the blood, of the primitive paschal lamb, but only a memorial, or representative sign. As to the unleavened cakes, bread, they were to remind the successive generations of the Jewish nation, of the haste, in which their ancestors left Egypt, not having time to leaven their *matzah*, before they were baked. They are also an inferior species of bread, indicative of poverty and a low state of civilization, and, therefore well calculated to symbolize their degraded condition in Egypt. Hence, they were wont to call them, the *bread of affliction*. Of the bitter herbs, it has already been stated, that they were designed to be emblematical of their former *bitter* state of bondage.

The Institution and Elucidation of The Lord's Supper.

I. The institution of the Lord's Supper. It was in the ominous and ever memorable night, preceding his painful but meritorious death, just one thousand five hundred and twenty-four years and a half after its institution, on the banks of the Nile, that our Lord, in company with his apostles, once more, and for the last time, celebrated the ancient and extraordinary anniversary festival of the *chosen people*—the Jewish Passover.* The little band of

* In this calculation, it is supposed that Jesus was thirty-three years and six months old, at the time of his crucifixion.

Christians, headed by the blessed Founder of the New Testament dispensation, ate and drank, at the paschal Supper, conformably to long established usage, in compliance with the Divine requirements, and in memory of the first Passover celebration in Egypt, the prototype, or model of all future Passovers. At last, in closing the paschal feast, they sang a psalm, as was customary, the farewell psalm, to a past epoch of time. How its tones must have trembled, and lingered, and clogged, on the lips, which should never more, as they had often been wont to do, sing sweet *hallel-psalms*, or utter joyous *hallelujah-refrains*. Jesus, at this critical moment, stood on the extreme confines of the ritual institutions, and civil polity of the Jewish nation: the Old Testament economy. It was an instance of time, in which a new order of things in the history of human experience, was to be inaugurated, and in signs and acts, ever to be held sacred, by all future generations.

The words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, to which the reader's attention is now invited, are recorded with slight textual variations, in the first three books of the New Testament, and in the eleventh chapter of the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. I shall transcribe them here, in the order in which they succeed each other. Matthew 26 : 26—28: "And as they were eating," still partaking of the Passover, "Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Mark 14 : 22—24: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they did all drink of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many." Luke 22 : 19—20: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, also the cup, after the Supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Paul: "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you:

this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood : this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me ; for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." Reference having been made, by the Saviour, to his second advent, and a hymn of praise and thanksgiving sung, the first communicants of the *Lord's table*, retired to Mount Olive. Thus, was instituted, and, for the first time celebrated, the Christian Passover, or Lord's Supper.

II. The elucidation of the Lord's Supper. The points of interest, which alone are essential in this investigation, in order to unfold the true sense, and thus render intelligible the undoubted design of the words and phrases, are contained in the sacramental institution of the Lord's Supper. Accordingly, attention is invited to the distinct and emphatic enunciations. The bread, this is my body ; the wine, this is my blood, or my blood of the New Testament ; the cup, this cup is the New Testament in my blood ; do this in remembrance of me, the injunction is twice repeated, according to St. Paul, as often as you eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do *show forth the Lord's death till he come* ; the bread and the wine ; Jesus offered up thanks for them, or pronounced a blessing upon them, that is, praised God for these inestimable gifts.

In view of these facts, I observe, that the bread and wine, which the Saviour used at the celebration of the first Lord's Supper, were paschal bread and wine. This is a point of grave moment. For, if the bread and wine, are to be considered as literally denoting the body and blood of our Lord, then it follows clearly that the Lord's Supper is not an altogether new institution, and that the Jews had already, for many ages anterior to the institution of the Lord's Supper, celebrated this sacrament, or commemorative rite. In the observance of the Passover, the bread and wine occupied a prominent place, in consequence of their great symbolical significance. Christ simply transferred these elements to his new institution, where they continued to express a similar symbolic, or emblematic significance, modified merely in so far as they became the representative signs of new relations, or different purposes. Their character, or nature is not in the least altered, and their functions are virtually the same. These pro-

positions must appear still more evident, when we bear in mind the fact, that the Saviour did not perform any liturgic act, which could have wrought a conversion, or transmutation of the bread and wine into any other substance, or entity; for he only made them the objects of blessing or^e thanksgiving, that is, he gave praise to God for them, *he did not consecrate them*, or confer on them fundamentally new natures and attributes, but only assigned them to a new relation, with the old mnemonic functions unimpaired. Even his benediction, at the use of the bread and wine, was an imitation, or adoption of the practice observed among the Jews, at their Passover celebration. It was the *special* invocation of a blessing upon *each separate course* of the feast: the concise, general formula of praise and thanksgiving had already been announced, and, as it seems, was regarded by our Lord, as entirely satisfactory. Jesus says of the sacramental bread, the Passover *matzah*, This is my body. This phraseology, I conceive, cannot mean the personal entity of the Saviour, his individual being, or identity; for this would involve a solecism, nay, a flat contradiction of the plainest and most reliable evidence of our senses, because "it is impossible," according to a universally recognized axiom, "for the same thing to be, and not to be." Hence, if bread is bread, as its name and use imply, and a distinct entity, it cannot, at the same time, be the body of our Saviour, and he cannot have intended that it should be so considered. The same argument holds equally true, in respect to the wine, in its relation to the blood of Jesus. Again, as the flesh or body of the annual paschal lamb, was not the first or original Passover lamb, or, in other words, identical with it, but only a symbol or representative sign of it; so the bread, primarily, the very same bread, which was used in the paschal feast, in the Lord's Supper, is not Christ, or his body, but only the symbol of him, in his divine capacity of Saviour, the index, pointing towards "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." Nor could the Jews, when they employed wine in the celebration of the Passover, have the remotest idea, that it was actually the blood of the primitive paschal lamb, shed on the night of the institution of the Passover, and stained on the lintels and posts of the door-ways of the habitations of their ancestors; the possibility of such a thought, implies a lack, or renunciation of common sense; but simply the sign or emblem of

the blood of the first Passover lamb. When, therefore, the Saviour declares the wine to be his blood, or the blood of the New Testament, he cannot wish to be understood literally, but metaphorically, and to mean that it *denotes* his blood, which he was about to shed, in introducing a new dispensation of grace, and, that hence, the sacramental wine is only symbolic, or indicative of his blood, thus applied and defined.*

The following striking facts, can hardly fail to elevate the fore-going remarks and illustrations to the rank and force of demonstrative proof. These facts are the command of our Lord, "Do this in remembrance of me," a command, which, according to St. Paul, he twice enjoined, during the administration of the Lord's Supper; and his assurance, For as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, *ye do show forth the Lord's death, till he come.*" These phraseologies are plain, forcible, decisive. The Lord's Supper, as far as bread and wine are constituent parts in its organic structure, is clearly reminiscent, or commemorative; it *shows* the Lord's death, that is, commemorates its cause and effect, or symbolizes it in the eucharistic use of bread and wine, as representative signs or emblems of the body and blood of Jesus; that is, of himself, as dying and dead. Again and lastly, I ask, how can the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, or the cake and wine, in remembrance of Jesus, be synonymous with an actual and literal eating and drinking of the Saviour's body and blood; that is, of himself, and yet be done in *remembrance* of him? For I remember what is past, and, therefore, absent, not what I possess in impending time, and which is, of course, present. To deny this, is to confound intuition with memory; the past with the present; and the impartial verdict of the reason and ex-

* It may be observed here, that it was almost universally customary among the nations of antiquity, to confirm compacts, or covenants, with blood, or blood and wine mixed. "The wine used on this occasion," at the institution of the Lord's Supper, writes Burder, in his *Oriental Customs*, "was an emblem and representation of the blood of Christ, about to be shed for the remission of sins. It was usual even among the heathens to make and confirm their covenants by drinking human blood, and that sometimes mixed with wine,"

perience of mankind, with blind credulity, or wilful rejection of truth.

Preliminary Observations on Metaphorical Language, briefly Illustrated by Examples.

Though the language of tropes, or in other words, of figurative language, is as Blair writes, "a deviation from what may be reckoned the most simple form of speech," it is "to be accounted part of that language which nature dictates to men." The Scriptures abound in rich and varied figurative language, the flowers and spices of articulate utterance, and, especially, in metaphor, at once, the most commanding, concise, and elegant style of oratory. It always implies an ellipsis, a figure of speech, by which one or more words are omitted, a fact, which the mind, at least, must recognize, otherwise it will be deceived and forced to false inference; false exegesis; and, what is worse than all, false doctrines. Thus, to illustrate the preceding remarks, by a few examples, deemed pertinent to the subject, the paschal lamb is *elliptically* often called the Passover, instead of the sign, or memorial of the Passover; yet, no one, acquainted with the origin and history of this celebrated rite, and endowed with a common share of intelligence, will infer from this summary style of speaking, that the lamb of the Passover, was either the Lord himself, or the *destroying* angel, mercifully passing by, or over, the blood-stained habitations of the departing Hebrews, while he smote every first-born offspring, in the doomed land of Egypt. The Psalmist, in the sweet and lofty strains of lyric song, and the lively enthusiasm of a fervid piety, calls God, *a rock, a fortress, a buckler, a horn, and a high tower*. Now take this language *literally*, and be sure, that being so taken, it is true, and there is an end—pardon the thought, Thou Great *I am*!—of God; of providence; and, sooner or later, as soon as the present order of things should cease, of the universe. Hence, we see how stupendous a folly it is, and how appalling are the consequences, which must result from a practice, as vicious as it is unphilological, to interpret metaphorical expressions literally. All that the royal poet designed, by this grand, figurative portraiture of the relation of the Supreme Being to him, was to express, in strong and ardent language, the outpouring of the heart-thoughts, the greatness, the power, and the goodness of his divine and gracious Bene-

factor. Jesus declares, *I am the way, and the truth, and the life*. What import is to be attached to these propositions, considering that this is metaphorical language, and that Jesus, though the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind, cannot be, at the same time, an abstraction and a concrete existence? That Jesus is a *way*, in the common acceptation of the term, and, therefore, synonymous with road, who can be so silly as to believe it? Nor can he be supposed to be a way, in the sense of a method of life and conduct, or truth and life, in their ethic abstraction, without concrete relations and attributes, without contradiction and self-stultification. By such phraseology, the Saviour can only mean to say, that he is Divinely appointed to direct mortals to the way, in which they should walk, or according to which they should live, and, that it is he, who, in an eminent degree, communicates to us the God-appointed truths and means, necessary to salvation. A fact, of the highest moment, in this investigation is, that at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the Saviour spoke neither in Greek nor Latin, but in the Chaldeo-Syriac language, common at that time, in Judea, and, which, like the Oriental languages generally, contains no terms which express the words *to mean, to signify, to denote, represent, symbolize, &c.*, and, that therefore, we have, and necessarily must have, metaphoric expressions in the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, additional examples of metaphorical language, in other parts of the Bible, and a reiteration of the reason for using such language, by our Saviour. Dr. Clarke, the erudite and able commentator, speaking of the passage, in the Lord's Supper, *This is my body*, proceeds thus: "Here, it must be observed, that Christ had nothing in his hands at this time, but part of that unleavened bread, which he and his disciples had been eating at Supper, and, therefore, he could mean no more than this, viz., that the bread which he was now breaking, *represented* his body, which, in the course of a few hours, was to be crucified for them. Common sense, unsophisticated with superstition and erroneous creeds; and reason, unawed by the secular sword of sovereign authority, could not possibly take any other meaning than this consistent and rational one, out of these words." "But," says a false and absurd creed, "Jesus meant, when he said, *hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body, and *hic est calix sanguinis mei*, this is the chalice of my blood, that the bread and wine were *substantially changed*

into his body, including flesh, blood, bones, yea, the whole Christ, in his immaculate humanity and adorable divinity !” And, for denying this, what rivers of righteous blood have been shed by state persecutions, and by religious wars ! Well, it may be asked, “Can any man of sense believe, that when Christ took up that bread, and broke it, that it was his own body which he held in his own hands, and which he himself broke to pieces, and which he and his disciples ate ?” He who can believe such a congeries of absurdities, cannot be said to be a *volunteer in faith* ; for it is evident, the man can have neither faith nor reason, as to *this* subject.

Besides, our Lord did not say, *hoc est corpus meum*—this is my body, as he did not speak in the Latin tongue ; though as much stress has been laid upon this question from the Vulgate, as if the original of the three evangelists had been written in the Latin language. Had he spoken in Latin, following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said, *Panis hic corpus meum significat*, or *symbolum est corporis mei* ; *hoc poculum sanguinem meum representat*, or *symbolum est sanguinis mei* : This bread signifies my body, this cup represents my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean*, *signify*, *denote*, though both the Greek and Latin abound with them. Hence, the Hebrews use a figure, and say, *it is*, for *it signifies*. So Gen. 41 : 26—27 ; The seven kine *are*—represent, seven years. This *is*—represents, the bread of affliction which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. Daniel 7 : 24 ; The ten horns *are*—signify, ten kings. They drank of the *spiritual Rock* which followed them, and the Rock was—represented, Christ, 1 Cor. 10 : 4. And following this Hebrew idiom, though the work is written in Greek, we find in Rev. I : 20 ; The seven stars *are*—represent, the angels of the seven churches ; and the seven candlesticks *are*—represent, the seven churches. The same form of speech is used in a variety of places in the New Testament, where this sense must necessarily be given to the word. Matthew 13 : 38—39 ; The field *is*—represents, the world ; the good seed *are*—represent or signify, the children of the kingdom ; the tares *are*—signify, the children of the wicked one ; the enemy *is*—signifies the devil ; the harvest *is*—represents, the end of the world ; and the reapers *are*—signify, the angels.

Tertullian, against Marcion, C. 40, seems to have had a correct notion of those words of our Lord, *Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei*: having taken the bread, and distributed *that body* to his disciples, he made it *his body*, by saying, This is my body, that is, a *figure* of my body.

That our Lord neither spoke in Greek or Latin, on this occasion, needs no proof. It was, most probable, in what was formerly called the Chaldaic, now the Syriac, that our Lord conversed with his disciples. Through the providence of God, we have complete versions of the Gospels in this language; and in them, it is likely, we have the precise words spoken by our Lord, on this occasion. In Matth. 26 : 26—27 the words in the Syriac version are, *Hanan pagree*: this is my body; *hanan demee*: this is my blood, of which forms of speech, the Greek is a verbal translation; nor would any man, even in the present day, speaking in the same language, use among the people to whom it was vernacular, other terms than the above to express, This represents my body, and This represents my blood.

But this form of speech is common, even in our own language; though we have terms enough to fill up the ellipsis. Suppose a man entering into a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient Greek sculpture, his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts; and, on inquiring what they are, he learns, this is Socrates, that Plato, a third Homer, others are Hesiod, Horace, Virgil, Demosthenes, Cicero, Herodotus, Livy, Cæsar, Nero, Vespasian, &c. Is he deceived by this information? Not at all; he knows well that the busts he sees, are not the *identical persons* of those ancient philosophers, poets, orators, historians, and emperors, but only *representations* of their persons in sculpture, between which and the original, there is as essential a difference, as between a human body, instinct with all the principles of rational vitality, and a block of marble. When, therefore, Christ took a piece of bread, brake it, and said, This is my body, who, but the most stupid of mortals could imagine, that he was, at the same time, handling and breaking his own body! Would not any person, of plain common sense, see as great a difference between the *man* Christ Jesus, and the piece of bread, as between the bust of marble and the philosopher it rep-

resented, in the case it referred to above? The truth is, there is scarcely a more common form of speech in any language, than *this is*, for, *this represents*, or *signifies*, &c.

Truth, lovely gift of heaven! is mighty, and should, ah, must prevail. It crowns with honor and glory him, that honestly and fearlessly seeks it; for he shall find it!

ARTICLE VI.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. J. T. BECK, PROF. OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TUBINGEN.

By REV. E. J. WOLF, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

The conception of a Christian Church, or communion, in its primitive or genuine sense, is original with the New Testament. Its ideal is not the outgrowth of the human mind, nor does society anywhere offer a similitude, except in the economy of the Old Testament, in the domain of revelation. There are elsewhere, it is true, religious associations, external alliances consisting of larger or smaller numbers, there are unions of a general religious character and for religious ends, but if we conceive the Christian Church to be purely, or chiefly, a religious association, and thence attempt to distinguish it from other religious societies, we at once lose sight of the peculiar character of the Christian Church, which constitutes its idea of a communion.

That peculiar character is not determined by a common external participation in certain forms: the first congregation had, in this respect, the preaching of the Word, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, all of which, falling in with the *Temple-cultus* still in vogue, connected themselves with the existing Judaism, yet there, already we read of an *ἐκκλησία* as distinct from Judaism, while on the other hand, repeated warnings are given in the Epistles, against sundry persons who were members of the Christian association, but who over-against the *ἐκκλησία* are designated *τινές*, and it is commanded to keep separate from these, and not to

acknowledge them as members of the congregation. The idea of an association does, therefore, not coincide with that of a Christian communion, 2 Tim. 2 : 9—21 ; Phil. 3 : 17 ; Matth. 13 : 36 ; Luke 13 : 25.

1. In its objective relation, the idea of the Church, in the Old and New Testament, is essentially determined by the peculiar nature of the kingdom of God, whose organ the Church is, and the kingdom of God is not only distinguished from the world and its religious organizations, but is diametrically opposed to them ; in its subjective relation, by the equally peculiar character of the children of God, who, likewise, are distinct from, and opposed to, all the rest of the world and its religious constituents. Thus, combined with the idea of the kingdom of God, and that of the Sonship of God's people, the Church of Christ takes in an order of conceptions, facts, and principles, entirely different from those, with which it is wont to appear in the religious associations of the world. It does not rest upon the plan of a human founder of religion, nor of a human administration, but upon the divine plan of redemption, as achieved by the atonement for the world, and the outpouring of the Spirit through the incarnation of the Son of God. For its constant advancement and final triumph, it is by no means dependent upon a human doctrinal development, or tendency, but on the word of the Spirit, which has neither been drawn from human consciousness, nor can it be circumscribed by any Confessional Symbolization, but which embraces and reveals purely and clearly the whole plan of redemption. This word of the Spirit. at the same time a spiritual government, which, until He shall appoint his own to reign with Him at his second coming (Matth. 19 : 28 ; Rev. 3 : 21 ;) recognizes one being, as its sole sovereign Lord, namely : the divine Son of Man, exalted to God's right hand. And this divine government, as administered by the sole occupant of the throne, is carried on in constant unison with the Eternal word ; His reign is characterized by grace and judgment, not the one without the other, and the end to be realized is, the formation of a Church with a divine temple of the Spirit, into a spiritual body of Christ. Eph. 2 : 20 ; 1 : 22.

These are the Scriptural foundations. Any assault upon these, any attempted change of these divine principles and facts, any tampering with these divine means and ends, any putting aside, or altering a single one of them, is

shown by the biblical conception of the Church, to be an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of the highest Monarch, in His sovereignty of Creator, Law-giver and King; it is high treason. Such efforts violate the name and nature of the Christian Church, they undermine its pillars, and frustrate its aim; they narrow the blessed channels, through which flows the transcendent power of God; they grasp the shadow instead of the substance.

The Church of Christ is, accordingly, no mere human society, either in the form of an independent religious association, or of a politico-religious institution. It does not merely gather spiritual teachers, and the citizens of a community into a peculiar relation, or a collective religious body, but it comprises children of God, animated by his Spirit, and citizens of the kingdom inwardly controlled by the divine law, who are united to their supermundane Sovereign, and to each other, not by a common *Cultus*, but by a spiritual and living communion.

The bond of fellowship is so peculiar and unique, that among all human relations and associations, none furnishes a parallel, save marriage and family relation. Eph. 5 : 23—33; 3 : 15. An organic union, therefore, is the basis. Representations drawn from earthly government and dominion, belong to the Church's future, as affected by the second coming of Christ. What distinguishes and elevates the family bond is this, that it is of divine origin. It is no mere external fellowship, or human development for useful ends. The marriage relation owes neither its origin, nor its perpetuation to human ordinances, or legislative enactments, or any mechanical, or statutory provisions. It is the relation of nature, a communion of love, arising from nature. Marriage, as it should be, is an organic condition, embracing the whole being in body and soul; it is the personal conjunction of body and soul, between man and wife, arising from, or after the manner of the flesh, *κατὰ σαρκά*. A similar personal reciprocal union, according to Scripture, exists between Christ and his Church, after the manner of the Spirit, *κατὰ πνεῦμα*.

The conditions to a union, in both instances, arise from an inward necessity, namely, so far as man and woman, even as Christ and men, according to their actual constitution, are adapted and fitted for each other, Coll. 1 : 16; John 1 : 4—11; Eph. 5 : 30. This inward necessity, however, produces no compulsion, voluntary faith and volun-

tary love, an optional, uncoerced choice brings and keeps together man and woman, Christ and his people. Again, as the marriage state, by means of generation and propagation produces, not a society merely, but a family of kindred, a household whose members are bound together by kindred dispositions, and united to each other in nature's bond of love, as children, as brothers and sisters, so the true bridal union with Christ, by the generation and propagation of the Spirit, gathers a family of God, whose members are born of the same spiritual seed, partakers of the same divine nature, forming not an artificial and mechanical, but a natural, organic, community of children and brethren, and, as such, they enjoy the immunities and prerogatives of God's household, while those, who are mere servants, or even bastards, though in the family, externally connected with it, and arrogating to themselves all manner of power, can only receive a brief and temporary tolerance without any claims, or inheritance as heirs, 1 Pet. 1 : 22 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 3 ; Matth. 23 : 8 ; Gal. 3 : 28 ; 4 : 7, 29 ; John 8 : 35. This is the only analogy to the Church, derived from the relations of human society.

3. Other analogies are taken from the domain of external nature. These, again, have nothing to do with any artificial arrangements of man, but are found in the organic sphere of creation, evincing spontaneity, nature, law and design. One similitude is furnished by the rock, with the structure erected out of, and upon it, an example of strength, system and durability, Matth. 7 : 24 ; 16 : 18 ; Eph. 2 : 20—22 ; 1 Cor. 3 : 10—15 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 4—8.

Another analogy is furnished by the seed, with the plant springing from it, pointing to the Church's growth and development from within, Mark 4 : 26 ; Matth. 13 : 38 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 23 ; Matth. 15 : 13 ; 1 Cor. 3 : 6—9 ; others, by the vine with its branches, the body consisting of head and members, relating to the internal nature and power of this communion, John 15 : 1—6 ; 1 Cor. 12 : 12. The rock, the seed, the vine, the Head, all these proceed purely from God, not in any wise from man. They represent Jesus Christ, in his peculiar person, in his own Spirit, word, and work. To add anything to this, or take anything from it, is an attack upon the foundations of the Church ; it is doing violence to its very essence ; it is sinning against the Head and Spirit, producing disorder and

ruin. The building and joining together, on the other hand, the sowing, planting, developing, is neither wholly the work of God, nor of man, but men are to coöperate with God, to be co-workers with Him, always, however, in such a way, that the human will not hinder or control the divine, but obey it and serve it, in such a way that God alone, in Jesus Christ, will have the honor of Creator and Lord, of Author and Finisher. God, in and through Christ, gives all things, and determines all things. From Him, and from Him alone, men are to seek and draw whatsoever is needed. They must aim at His glory, and surrender themselves to His will, if they would receive anything at His hand, and, that which is received must not be mixed with any foreign additions, but is to be used, dispensed and improved, in constant dependence upon the Lord. 1 Peter 4 : 10 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 17 ; Coll. 2 : 6—10, 18 ; Eph. 3 : 14—21 ; Lev. 6 : 46—49 ; Rev. 22 : 11—14.

The Establishment and Genetic Development of the Church.

Preliminary Remarks. The name "Church," the etymology of which is still undecided, is not of Scriptural origin. It belongs to an historical development, in which Christians formed themselves into a politico-religious association. The use of the term has been productive of immense mischief. It has been employed in the most arbitrary manner, to designate, now an abstraction, then a reality, at one time an ideal, at another an empirical thing, surrounding the subject with error, disorder and confusion, causing evermore the return of the question, "What is the Church," or in reference to the different empirical Churches, the question, "Which is the true Church?" In answer to this, again, that which belongs only to the true Church of Christ, is attributed to some particular "Church," without regard to its spiritual, or moral condition, and independent of its relation to the true Church universal. Or, in order that some particular "Church" may be secured as the true Church, the term is employed in such a manner, that by it, we are not to understand a number of particular individuals of a peculiar character, but a set of institutions, ordinances, forms and symbols. These will constitute the persons participating in them, into a true Church! Finally, a singular contradiction exposes itself, in this matter, among the New Theologians, who boast of having discovered, that the Holy Scriptures are

not the the Word of God, but that the Word of God is in the Scriptures, while on the other hand, the true *Ecclesia* of Christ, is not only found within the empirical Church, but this empirical Church is the true Church, invested with all its authority and power! It would be difficult to decide which of these views is the more unchristian and ungodly. What God has joined together, let no man put asunder. But, what man has joined together, in the unholy mixtures which, in too many cases, constitute "the Church," let no one dare to invest with the title, the privileges, the authority of the Church of the Lord Jesus.

1. *Historical Account of the Name and Conception of the Church.* The Christian Church connects with the Church of the Old Testament, which is called קהל, קהל, קהל, translated by the Seventy, sometimes *ἐκκλησία*, sometimes *συναγωγή*, I Mac. 4 : 59. The O. T. Church, already, is called an "*Ecclesia*," not as a mere gathering, or assembly, but as a gathering, or congregation, chosen and selected from the rest of mankind, a people, a communion, chosen and gathered by God, to be His peculiar people. Gen. 32 : 2 ; 8 ; Ps. 74 : 2.

Both Churches, that of the Old, and that of the New Covenant, were founded by a divine act ; they are not the work of man, they are a divine creation. The Christian Church is, however, the completion or consummation of the O. T. Church. Their being founded of God, and belonging to God, which both have in common, is accomplished for the Christian Church, by a divine act of atonement encompassing eternity, and by the communication of the Holy Ghost. So, too, the election, common to both, is in the N. T. Church, no longer confined to one nation externally separated from the rest of the world, but the call extends to all the earth, and men are chosen from every nation under heaven. Possessing this elective character, consisting of a chosen people, the N. T. Church in its immediate origin, is called *ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλέω*. This term designates the totality of those composing an individual, local, congregation, as well as the entire membership of Christ's Church. 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; Eph. 1 : 22. Its external union does not derive its character, or form, from the *Cultus of the Temple*, but from that of the Synagogue. The name *συναγωγή* used both of the Jewish houses of prayer, and the assemblies held in them, is transferred to the

Christian Church, Ja. 2 : 2. In Heb. 10 : 25, the Christian assembly, in distinction from the Jewish Synagoge, is called *ἐαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν*, "their own, particular assembly," which had begun to be neglected, by some who were under Judaizing influences. The completion of the O. T. *Temple Cultus* is reserved for the time of Christ's future coming. The Temple-idea has, for the present, only a spiritual significance in the Christian Church. Eph. 2 : 22 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 5 ; Heb. 13 : 10, 13—15. The Jews, regarding themselves *par excellence*, the *ἐκκλησίαν*, Christians are spoken of and treated as *Ἀποσυνάγωγοι*, but that which marks the Church's distinction from Judaism, is the designation *ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; 10 : 32 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 15. As such, however, as *ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ*, the Church from its very start, asks no recognition as a particular organization or political corporation. Its adherents are everywhere regarded as *παρεπιδημοι*, as *διασπορά*, 1 Pet. 1, 2 : 11 ; James 1 : 1 ; Phil. 3 : 20. The realization of the idea of a political corporation, like that of the Temple, is reserved for the new *æon* when the Christocracy shall appear as World-Sovereignty, with peculiar kings and priests.

The word *ἐκκλησία*, used of Jewish political or worshiping assemblies, is prophetically employed by Christ in Matt. 16 : 18, to designate the communion he was about to establish. The word here, according to the context, signifies, the adherents, disciples, subjects of the kingdom of heaven, as they are constituted by faith in Christ, as the Son of the living God and united to each other in his name. Matt. 16 : 16, 18 ; 18 : 18, 20 cf. 17.

As an accomplished fact, the *ἐκκλησία* is first mentioned in Acts 2 : 47. The import and nature of this title is there established by sundry acts of *καλεῖν*, to wit: the divine *προσκαλεῖν* (v. 39) the divine call to salvation through Christ and the individual application of it; the apostolic *παρακαλεῖν* (v. 40) a call involving separation from the mass (this untoward generation); this is followed in the subject by a voluntary calling upon the name of the Lord *ἐπικαλεῖν* (v. 21). It is by this process that the soul gains admission into the economy of grace in Christ, v. 41 : 47 cf. 21. And these acts of the *καλεῖν*: the divine *προσκ*, * * * the *παρακ*—*ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταυτῆς*, which is the same as *ἐκκαλεῖν*, and the corresponding *ἐπικαλεῖν* as the human and subjective act—not, therefore, the mere external hearing of the word and external baptismal fellowship—furnish the true con-

ception of the "*ecclesia*," in its etymological and historical root. The Church in its construction appears neither as a purely objective fact, as simply a divine institution, nor as a purely subjective thing, a human association, but, primarily the divine objective enters into a definite relation with the human subjectivity, by means of *καλεω*, and the subjective enters into a corresponding relation with the divine objectivity, by means of *αποδεχεσθαι τὸν λόγον*, not immediately by means of *βαπτίζεσθαι*. The Church, therefore, comes into being with the objective and subjective, thus combined through the medium of a believing *ἐπικαλεσθαι*.

It consists, as it is likewise designated, Act. 4 : 32, of "the multitude of them that believe," of the congregation of believers. (Aug. Con. Art. VII.) All these words and ideas, however, find their fixed and definite meaning in the historical Christ. Jesus, who is both "Lord and Christ," is the historical and fundamental groundwork of the Christian Church. Act. 2 : 36, 38, 41. He is not to be viewed as merely the reflex of Christian consciousness, or the outgrowth of it; a Christian consciousness is immanent in Christ, and can proceed only from him. The specific consciousness of the New Testament, is not produced by the general Messianic idea of Judaism. It is realized as the product of that, which the Messiah, as he manifested himself in Jesus, *is, has done and suffered*—as the product of his peculiar personality and history.

Nor must the fact be overlooked, that Christ, in the unfolding of his personal activity, with the adherence of the people, yea, even Jesus, with the circle of his disciples, does not yet constitute a Christian Church. The Church was not founded until His Messianic personality and activity had culminated in the atonement for the world, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and God's ancient word of prophecy, according to the spirit, if not the letter, had become a new word of the Spirit, and served as the "*διακονία*," "ministry" of the atonement, and of the Holy Ghost. Luke. 24 : 44—49; Acts 2 : 16; 32 : 36, 38; 2 Cor. 5 : 18—20, &c.

When Christ had, in word, and deed, and spirit, finished and disclosed the work of Redemption, peculiar to, and immanent in, Him, as the one great and sole plan of salvation, and when the call of God in its divine power through Christ, to sunder men from out of the world, found immediate and cordial reception in their personal lives, then and

there the Church entered upon its existence. And in this, its historic inception, the Church of Christ presents itself to our view, as the totality of those, who by the same appropriation of the divine Gospel of Redemption, were made partakers of the salvation, and the spirit of Christ.

Inasmuch as the Christian conception of the Church, does not rest upon a purely objective divine foundation, but at the same time, upon a subjective human foundation of faith, the design of the Church demands, in addition to the objective and divine act, the planting and development of a state of faith in the subjects, corresponding to the divine objective; and this is accomplished by means of a school of faith, by the instruction and training of disciples. As Christ himself followed this course, so he expressly enjoins it upon His apostles. Matth. 28: 19; Mark 16: 15; Luke 24: 47.

This initiative instruction, this making of disciples, inculcating with deep earnestness and power, the elements of repentance and faith, this was the touch-stone, with which those, who had already been prepared for the Christian congregation, operated upon the mass of those who were as yet among the unprepared. The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament was the elementary, preparatory book, the divine catechism, out of which, and by means of which, the apostolic Word, as well as the Word of Christ, was intended to lead them forward into Christian truth. 2 Tim. 3: 14; 2 Pet. 1: 19; Rom. 1: 1; 1 Cor. 15: 1. Along with the objective foundation which is laid in the divine fact of the Redemption, the additional, historical, fundamental basis of the Christian Church consists in the training of a discipleship, in a fostering, cultivating school of Christ. This is its *embryo development*. Its formal establishment is achieved by the preaching and belief of the accomplished redemption, and the reception of the Holy Spirit.

2. *Genetic Formation and Establishment of a Christian Church.* This consists of the training of a discipleship in a school of faith. This training, or education of disciples, according to the view which Christianity, without exception, gives of the universal condition of man, and of the world, has no more historical significance in the past, but it must be pursued everywhere on the depraved soil of human nature, and in the midst of a morally and spiritually degenerate society. It is the province and duty of

this disciple-school, to bring relief and deliverance from the corrupt condition of nature and society, by means of moral and religious transformation. For this end a mere external union, or an association, with a specific *Cultus* form will not suffice. The school of Christ requires spirit, moral cultivation, and spiritual training. It devolves upon this school first of all to impart instruction, an instruction resting upon the most general truths of the world's depravity, and of the divine kingdom, but always more specially concentrating in the presentation of the person and redeeming work of Christ, in order to call forth a personal faith in him, as the personal Saviour. The great faith doctrines, therefore, as guiding to, and producing faith in, Jesus Christ, are the educational means to be employed in the disciple-school. These thoughts are drawn chiefly from the course, which the the Saviour himself pursued, and through which He fulfilled his promise: I will build a Church, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail. The slow and cautious procedure of our Lord, is specially significant and admonitory for us on a soil, where, as among the Jews, the divine truths and ordinances, as well as a certain knowledge of Christ and his kingdom are indigenous, but have been traditionally weakened, and in part adulterated and perverted. His course serves as an exemplar, where an ecclesiastical form or system already exists. The more summary process of the apostles serves as a norm more particularly on a soil that has never been cultivated. Yet, here again, we must observe, no choice is left to us, and no deviation from their course is sanctioned, and that the congregations formed by them, have their origin in disciple associations. It is in the bounds of these, that the congregational organization is completed and matured. The title *μαθηται* in place of *εκκλησία* is employed in thirty different passages of the Acts of Apostles. The further *διδασκειν* ("instruction") then of these disciples and their continuation in the *διδασχῇ* of the apostles led into the true Church-life of the congregations which had already been formed, but which still continued to draw the *μαθηται* into their bosom, in which they were to be improved and perfected. To such congregations the Epistles were addressed. Hence they, on the one hand, hold up the high prerogatives of the Church, on the other, they guard and warn it against coalitions and mixtures with

such evils as might yet cleave to the *μαθηται*. Hence arises, likewise, the distinction they make between weak and strong, between *νηπιος* and *τελειος*, between carnal and spiritual. The whole of them, however, through repentance and faith, *i. e.*, personal conversion, sundered themselves from the world and entered upon the way of the Lord. If in the course of time it became manifest, that this was not the case with some, recourse was had to discipline, and where this failed excommunication took place.

So far, then, as the congregational fellowship rests upon discipleship and the means of training employed by the latter are a *διδασχη* and a *παιδαγωγία*, we learn from the example and norm of Christ, the true manner of procedure in the formation of churches, anywhere and at all times. The existing ecclesiastical politics or religious systems were not attacked after a revolutionary fashion. An external overthrow of existing relations was in no way aimed at, neither was an external separation demanded of those adherents and disciples, who had been won. As little was the work, on the other hand, a conservative or restorative struggle, for the maintenance of what had once been established, in its temporary, or local narrowness, imperfection and weakness; still less, did any internal, or external disorder receive the slightest aid, or connivance, in the interests of conservatism; but the divine doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, with its inwardly emancipating and transforming truth, with its sharper severity and higher intensity of the law, with its earnest call to repentance, and with its blessedness and fruitfulness resulting from faith, continued from time to time, to be more fully and more specifically enforced. Through this course, there arose immediately a moral antithesis to the existing state of things, a moral antithesis of doctrine and of practice. And this in two directions: first, opposition to the binding force of external authority. This was the case with Christ and his apostles, in their connection with Judaism—which, itself rested upon divine institutions, and from which salvation was to proceed—within the circle, therefore, of correct doctrine, within the bounds of the Othodox Church. The other form of opposition was, that which manifested itself against subjective arbitrariness, for instance, Sadduceeism, Temple-deseccration, &c. This position, however, was taken and maintained, not by mechanical, or forcible measures, nor by dogmatizing formulas, but by means of a

moral and spiritual verdict, by the power of the truth and of the Spirit, the opposing principle is enforced by the moral *critique*, and moral corrective energy of the divine testimony. The process, therefore, instead of being revolutionary, is reformatory and preformative, acting and operating from within outward, in a continuous and steadily advancing course of instruction, which, at the same time, is of a formative and educative nature—pedagogical in its character, not doctrinal, or scholastic. By these means they endeavored to produce repentance and faith. These are the foundations which the gates of Hell cannot overthrow. Repentance consists more particularly in self-renunciation, and the renouncing of the world. By this act men are spiritually, more and more delivered from the influences of their own selfish nature, and freed from the controlling power of all outward relations; even so by faith, as the personal surrender to the Lord, his word and work, they become more and more united to the one divine influence and truth in Christ. In this way, they are, at the same time, builded together with each other, into a spiritual and living *typus*, and on this true foundation, a oneness or union of sentiment and conduct is produced. *This is the evangelical plan of union.*

In this training up of disciple-factors who will bring forth, as actual fruits, the end aimed at, and in the proper use of the functions and means hereunto appointed; in these consists the object, the province, the charge of the reforming and preforming work, if a true Church of Christ is to be organized; otherwise a mere religious association, or an external ecclesiastical system will be manufactured.

A Christian Church can only be organized after the manner of the Spirit, *i. e.*, it must be organized internally, and by internal means, before its individual members are collected and constituted into a particular external congregation. These individuals must always be first sought out in the ever existing sphere of nature, and of the world, and then prepared and trained for the spiritual fellowship of the body of Christ.

3. *The Particular Organization of the Church.* The O. T. Church was externally founded and organized in connection with the revelation of the law; the N. T. Church, in connection with the revelation of the spirit. The band of disciples, that had been trained by Christ, and that, in

the acts of the apostles, prior to the outpouring of the Spirit, were simply called *μαθηται*, not yet *εκκλησια*, were filled with the Holy Ghost, who seizing them individually brought a spiritual life to pass in each of them. This band of disciples endued with the power of the Spirit, constitutes the nucleus of the Church, to which an increasing number of new believers joined themselves. Acts 2 : 43 ; 47. How did this take place ?

(a) Primarily a summary testimony was given of the Gospel plan of salvation, in its universality, and to those moved by this a special call to embrace it was extended in the name of the Lord. This appears in Acts 2, as the *objective* condition, and means of realizing a Christian Church.

The *subjective* condition is a voluntary surrender to the call of salvation, induced by the uncorrupted presentation of fundamental and eternal truths, and grounded upon a believing change of heart. The decisive test, was not the length of a course of instruction, nor a certain amount of acquirements, but the criterion was this: That the great truths and doctrines of salvation, found entrance into, and produced a change of heart. Acts 2 : 37. This must ever continue the norm for us. It was necessary then, and it still is, that the believing change of mind should verify itself, by some positive act, which will decisively sever the individual from his old associations, and sunder him from his former manner of life. This, in the primitive Church, was actually done through baptism, as the spontaneous, public, solemn uniting with the despised Christ and his word. When Christianity, according to its inward constitution, stood in full and decided opposition to the world, and in its outward form, was the object of universal hatred and contempt, then, and there, baptism was an act, authenticating and confirming the individual's faith. And as this matter was left to free personal choice, and that choice influenced and determined by nothing but the internal conscientious conviction of the subject, the voluntary reception of baptism constituted the actual criterion of the renunciation of self, and the world. If, in exceptional cases, deception, or hypocrisy, chanced to be practiced, the subject would, on the one hand, continually stand under the rigid surveillance of all the others, while on the other hand, amid the numerous external pressures brought to bear upon him, he could not long escape detec-

tion. In the event of one being exposed, tolerance was not thought of; reformation was required, and when this failed, he was excommunicated.

(b) *Let us observe more closely the subjects constituting the Church.* It is evident, from what has been said, that *faith* is the distinctive element of the Church—a faith, indeed, which on the one hand, is grounded upon a practical, experimental knowledge of the divine economy of grace, and a change of heart, as both are induced by the word of redemption, and which, on the other hand, through the medium of a baptismal profession enters into the fellowship, of the law of Christ and his Spirit. In this fellowship, however, there is from the start, a distinction among the members themselves: there are found those who are spiritually strengthened, who have already been baptized with the Spirit's power and light, who, in the knowledge of the truth, in the obedience and liberty of the truth, are ensamples to the rest. And even among these, again a gradation appears, as was the case with the apostles themselves. On the other hand, we find spiritual babes, new-born, who are still weak, having but the Spirit receptive—the elements of a spiritual life, not as yet the full, or developed light and power of the Spirit. Nevertheless, they are fraternally, (not hierarchically) united with the rest, and through them, in a process of constant advancement in the sanctification of the Spirit, and the knowledge of the truth. Acts 2 : 41; Rom. 15 : 1—3; 6; Heb. 5 : 12; 1 Cor. 3 : 1; 1 Peter 2 : 2; 2 Th. 2 : 13. Such distinctions are recognized in the Church, but not the distinction between believers and unbelievers, or converted and unconverted members.

4. From what has been said upon the genetic formation and the organization of the Church, we may now proceed to give *the true idea of a Church*. A Christian Church answers to its historic origin and character, when the union is really a voluntary one, and consists of believers, (Acts 2 : 41; they that received the word, 4 : 32,) of such believers, especially, as have, on the basis of the eternal doctrines of salvation, attained a change of heart, sundering them from the world. Matth. 10 : 37; Luke 14 : 46. Such as acknowledge and worship Jesus Christ, who is rejected by the world, as their Lord, and through this belief of the truth are sanctified; in other words, of such as have made peace with God, through the righteousness of Christ,

and continue in the sanctification of the Spirit, as their calling. Thus, the Church is truly the peculiar people of God, chosen by God from out of the world. 1 Cor. 1 : 2; 1 Peter 1 : 2. The mere proclamation of the Gospel, or the pure doctrine, and the hearing of it, though all of it be, in general, believed, does not constitute the Christian Church, or a member of it. The pure doctrine was nowhere wanting when Christ preached, and believing hearers, in a general sense, were almost everywhere found, but all this only prepared the way for the Church. It was introductory to the true Church condition. Neither does a formal confession of faith, or symbol form the constituent element of a Church. The original Church commenced and continued without one. But *faith*, affecting heart and life, must be added to the pure word of truth, in other words, a believing confession of the pure truth, proceeding from the heart, and verifying itself in actual obedience, constitutes the subject a member of the Church of Christ. Acts 8 : 37; Rom. 10 : 9; 1 : 5; 6 : 17; Matth. 7 : 21—24; John 8 : 30; 1 John 2 : 3, &c.

Faith, therefore, in its specific and eternal character, involving the heart and life, is the essential, constituent element of the Church, both in the individual and in the congregation. Hence, the question, whether the unbelieving and unconverted may be embraced in the Church, whether they belong to the conception of the Church, is easily answered. We must, in the first place, distinguish the present from the original condition of the Church. If this question be brought to bear upon the modern ecclesiastical communities [in Europe,] it must not be forgotten, that these have come into being, by a process entirely different from that under which the Bible Church was founded. They gain their members, not by free conviction, and voluntary connection, but they annex them by means of external and involuntary bonds, by the power of political favor, or detriment, &c. These associations, therefore, must embrace involuntary members, and, accordingly, tolerate within their communion unbelieving and unconverted persons. This is, also, the case, when ecclesiastical fellowship is identified with a national religious culture, as for instance, where the Church is a national, or state institution. Here, too, the unbelieving and unconverted cannot be excluded, as improper elements, so long as they do not array themselves in actual opposition against the Church, so long as

they do not avow, or show themselves, absolutely irreligious. But the state of the case is very different, when we come to the Church of the Bible, to an actual congregation, an "*Ecclesia*," where a voluntary faith is the first, and constant pre-requisite, and constitutes the badge of ecclesiastical fellowship. As *faith*, in its Scriptural sense, includes *conversion*, a biblical Church must, necessarily, exclude the unconverted and unreformed. John 15 : 19 ; 17 : 8 ; 14, 16 ; Rom. 8 : 9 ; 1 Cor. 6 : 9—11, &c. The unbelieving and unconverted may, through mistake, oversight, or usurpation, intrude themselves into the Christian Church. They are in it then, *de facto*, but not *de jure*, and though there externally, yet internally, their union with the Church is impossible. The Scriptural idea does not regard them, as called, or "chosen," hence, as soon as they become manifest as unbelievers, they are, as far as possible, made the subjects of ecclesiastical discipline, and expelled from the communion.

As certainly then as conversion, in virtue of personal faith, and the spiritual union with Christ produced by it, determines the reality of Church-fellowship, (Acts 2 : 39—41,) so certainly does the definition of the Church, given by the Reformers, not only convey the ideal, or philosophic conception of the Church, but that definition is essential to her historic, and only conception ; it is essential to her sole reality, to her actual existence. The Church is the communion of believers and saints, standing in the knowledge and confession of the great truths of salvation, and who, by the same Gospel, and by the same Holy Spirit, are formed together into a spiritual body of Christ. (Aug. Con. Arts. VII, VIII, Apol. IV.)

The fundamental idea of the specific conception of the Church is, accordingly this: *The Church is a communion, or union, essentially and actually formed, and continued only by means of an inward reality, by means of a believing, living, spiritual union with the Lord, on the basis of his Word and Sacraments.* It is the doctrine of the symbols, as it is of the Scriptures, that the unbelieving and ungodly cannot possibly be members of the true Church.

They are merely possible adherents, external participants. Their adherence to the Church is incidental, abnormal, not as with members, an internal, essential, normal union. The presence of such persons in the true Church is an external possibility, relatively inevitable, but they stand in in-

ternal opposition to the idea of the Church, as is most clearly set forth in the "Apology": *Sunt enim membra regni diaboli, &c., &c.*

Wherever these are constituent members of a Church, however, this is itself a proof, that such a congregation, considered as a whole, is a mere outward religious association, and not the true Church. Though as members, they outwardly participate in the Word and Sacraments, they do not share in the blessings of justification and sanctification mediated through them. The assertion, that baptism constitutes the Church, is a contradiction of the VIIth Article of the Augsburg Confession. This teaches, not that the mass of those who are baptized constitute the Christian Church, but "the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." Since the ungodly and unbelieving stand in direct internal opposition to the Church, they must needs be separated from a healthy congregation. 1 Cor. 5 : 11 ; 2 Cor. 6 : 14. Where, from want of external power, or in virtue of other circumstances, this is impossible, the distinction between believers and unbelievers must still continually be set forth—in a spiritual manner, by the testimony and doctrine of the Word—and what belongs to the former alone must, in no way, be adjudged, or conceded to the latter. When, however, in ecclesiastical communion, it has come to this, that unbelieving and unconverted men are there, not as mere outward necessary evils, but their membership is claimed and vindicated, as an internal necessity, then this must be considered as the same guilty sort of necessity, through which corruptions, and offences, in general, come into the world. The Church is thereby proved to have become secularized, and falls under the same woe which has been denounced against the world. It may then be said, Woe to the Church, as well as woe to the world. Such offences are permitted to come, not only through God's forbearance, but also, in virtue of His justice, *i. e.*, not only according to the law of the free development of sin, but also, according to the law of the just consequences of sin. But this does not justify those evil necessities, or render them guiltless and inculpable ; neither on the other hand, does an instance of condemnation and casting off, according to divine law and order, suppose forcible compulsion, or absolute reprobation. The former principle is violated

by obstinate adherents of the established Church, the latter, by over zealous antagonists of it.

The view here given, relative to the divine forbearance and divine justice, is taken from the parables in Matthew 13. The rejected tares had the power of development, by divine sufferance, but the development, they were permitted to make, was not a designed, an authorized, or a justified development. It is a perverse development, violating what had been divinely purposed, and it cannot escape final punishment. Those parables are historical descriptions of the development of Christ's kingdom, and not doctrinal statements of what God designed that development to be. And they do not describe the kingdom as it will, or should shape itself, *within* the Church of Christ, in accordance with the will and law of the Lord, but they portray the form, with which it appears under God's forbearance and grace, upon the mixed surface of the world; they set forth the manner in which, upon this promiscuous domain it operates and suffers, until the day of judgment.

Our Lord, in Matth. 13 : 24—30; 38, does not say, The field is my Church, my "*Ecclesia*," but the field is the world. (See Apology.) This abnormal development is possible, and takes place only through the combination of human negligence and satanic activity. It is, accordingly, a sinful development; on the part of God merely tolerated, being neither designed nor justified. The "world," on the other hand, does not mean, that part of the world uninfluenced and untouched by Christianity, the heathen, or unchristian world, but the world contemplated as the field of Christ, (v. 24, "on his field," 27, "thy field,") and this the world is, so far as his Gospel seed has been scattered upon its soil. The Christian world is meant, not the Heathen, or Jewish world. It is the Church, not in its peculiar sense, as distinguished from the world, but in the broader empirical sense.

This "world," on which in various ways, the word of God has been sown, is taken in connection with the kingdom of God, not only where the children of the kingdom are found upon its soil, as the product of the divine seed upon good ground, but wherever the name, the seed, the word of Christ has acquired a certain influence, so that the children of the wicked even bear a Christian likeness, (ζιζανιον, "tares," cockle-weed, spurious wheat,) as the tares have a strong resemblance to the wheat. The children of

the world even, have in the Christian world, the appearance of wheat. Their worldly life has a Christian tinge. they observe Christian customs. Theirs is an inferior, an outward, a counterfeit Christianity. This Christianized domain, this mixture of true and apparent Christians, this field of the Lord, the parable designates not *ἐκκλησία*, the Church proper, but *κόσμος*, the world. If the name of Church be applied to the whole mixed field, as is customary now, then we must be careful to distinguish such world-Church, such empirical Church, from the "*Ecclesia*" of Christ, the Church of the kingdom, distinctively and exclusively composed of the children of the kingdom, as the ground (v. 8,) bearing good fruit is distinguished from the rest of the field.

The wheat only, which was produced from the Lord's seed, is spoken of as representing the children of the kingdom, therefore, only those who are begotten of the word of God, those begotten of God, *those who are born again*, constitute the true Church of the kingdom. This is the real, true Church, which the Lord himself, by means of His word and Holy Spirit, is building into a structure, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, a structure, at the rearing of which Satan does not assist, nor mix in his sowing and working, as is the case with the world, [or state] Churches. Wherefore, the Church is called the Temple of God, not a field overgrown with weeds—a Temple in which, not only the name and word of Jesus Christ are preached and confessed, but in which dwells the spirit of God. It is the chosen generation, and not a mongrel generation. It is a generation so diametrically opposed to all other elements, that between it and them there is an essential distinction, as great as that between light and darkness, or between the seed of God, and the seed of Satan. How then, can the two form one body, under one head, or how can they form an organic union? Both elements, it is true, have a common soil, but this the Lord expressly declares, is the soil of the world, and not a common Church soil. There is no organic union between them, but a mere external fellowship, so far as the name and word of Christ still obtain in the world. On this ground, or domain of the world, on this mongrel field, the evil and the good, the true and the false, are to continue together, until the judgment. 1 Cor. 5 : 10—13. While the Church, on the other hand, is expressly enjoined to

exclude here already from its fellowship, whatever becomes manifest as the seed of Satan.

With the last parable, that of the net, the sense is the same. Here, too, the true character of the Church is not under consideration, but the historical development of the kingdom of God within the world, so far as this kingdom extends beyond the Church. As this is the last parable, so it represents the last course the Gospel will take through the world. Matth. 24: 14. The net, *σάγην*, signifies external force, according to which men of every class, in the tumult and confusion of their terror, will be drawn within the precincts of Christianity, as is the case among fishes, in the drawing of a net. Immediately upon this gathering of the net, the great judgment is held; immediately upon the full draught, follows the thorough severance of the good from the wicked, and in consequence of this, the rejection of everything that is unfit, or useless, for the Church of the kingdom. The kingdom of heaven, thereupon, assumes its external aspect, as the reign of the justified, after that, by the grace and forbearance of God, the false and the evil had been suffered to intrude into the field, and into the net, but not into the body of Christ.

The Parables, like the Apocalypse, are historical descriptions. But the historical development is not the pure, just and genetic character of the Church. It must be judged of, by the original and authentic constitution of the Church. From mere historical developments, we can derive no doctrines, or principles, which conflict with the express definitions and laws of the biblical "*Ecclesia*." Every departure from the explicit and positive will, design and method of the Lord, is, and ever will be, unbelief and disobedience, though it may have ever so extensive an historical development. And, although in such a course men profess to be actuated by the purest and best motives, it must ever, in accordance with the express law and judgment of God, be regarded as disobedience and rebellion. The subjective view, or aim, does not alter the case, it becomes the subject, rather with penitence, to acknowledge his error, and seek to obtain forgiveness. And, if in the Church, as in the world, the divine sovereignty overrules many an evil for good, this must be ascribed to the grace of God, and not to any human wisdom or desert.

5. General results from the foregoing. a. The voluntary

union alone of the believing and converted disciples of the Gospel constitutes, in the proper sense, the true Christian Church, the real *Ecclesia*, or communion, unto whom accrue the spiritual immunities of the kingdom of God, namely: the forgiveness of sins, the bestowment of the Holy Ghost, and all associated gifts and blessings. The unconverted and unbelieving are excluded from the conception, and essential character of the Church. The Church excludes them, as standing in opposition to it. Should they even be in external connection with it, this does not make them members of the true Christian Church. They belong to the Christian world, unto whom the Gospel is preached, and shall continue to be preached for their acceptance, with exhortation and entreaty, with reproof and invitation, but never dare we proceed with force, nor award them the gracious spiritual treasures of the μαθηται. Matth. 28 : 19 ; Mark 16 : 15. Repentance and faith must first prepare and qualify them, before they can be incorporated with the Church of Christ, or an individual congregation be formed.

b. It cannot, however, on the other hand be claimed, that the true Christian Church has no sins, or sinning individuals within its fold. The converted and believing, it is true, are nowhere in the Bible, unless when their former condition is under review, (1 Tim. 1 : 15,) designated as sinners, ἁμαρτωλοι, for this term is employed only of such as are guilty of particular transgressions, or live in habitual sin. Luke 6 : 32—34 ; Rom. 5 : 8 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 9 ; 1 Peter 4 : 18 ; 1 Cor. 9—11, &c.

Nevertheless, the converted even have always some sin remaining, in virtue of their natural disposition, ἁμαρτια, and they still commit sin. 1 John 1 : 8—10. They are holy, only so far as they have been made holy through justification by faith in Christ, and continue in the sanctification of the Spirit. Apart from this, ungodly and unconverted people may actually be found in the Church ; this, however, only *de facto*, not *de jure*, only through man's oversight, or the force of circumstances. They are not knowingly and willingly to be received and recognized as members of the Church. "They were not of us." (1 Jno. 2 : 19). To open sinners and unbelievers, we dare not consciously, or formally adjudge the privileges and rights of citizenship in the kingdom of God. They have no claim nor right in it. They can only, for the present, be

passively tolerated. They must not only be satisfied to find the Church conceding nothing to their unbelief and worldliness, but they must submit these to the teachings and discipline of the Church. Limited to this passive attitude, and as the subjects of pedagogic, or disciplinary treatment, yea, of zealous combating, we find temporarily in the Churches of the apostles, unholy individuals, who had crept in through oversight, or the force of circumstances. But they were not consciously received and recognized as members.

Where, on the other hand, unbelief and worldliness actively assert themselves, there it is the province of the Church to place the given person under discipline, and, in the event of this failing, excommunication becomes necessary, or, on the part of the offender, voluntary withdrawal. 1 Cor. 5 : 2, 11, 13 ; 2 Cor. 6 : 17 ; 2 Thess. 3 : 6.

c. The essential idea or character of the Christian congregation, with its peculiar prerogatives, can never be properly or justly extended over the totality of a church that is not founded upon a voluntary, self-determined union of individuals, and that knowingly gathers together the unconverted, unbelieving and worldly as being actually entitled to all ecclesiastical privileges, nor must it be extended to a church that cannot purify itself from those who are openly wicked. It is only the believing and converted that in such a mass constitute the true Church. Should there be but two or three united in the name of Christ, they, and not the totality of the congregation, compose the Church. The mass of them form but a world-church, as permitted by God's patience, not the Church founded and ordained of God, the body of Christ.

That such degenerate churches still preserve in them certain things divinely ordained and established, and not only those divinely permitted, does not entitle them to the claim of being the Church of God. For that which belongs to the divine *πίστις* and *εντολή* is not the outgrowth or merit of a degenerate church. It is merely the charge committed to them for the pure and faithful administration, of which they are held responsible. It is their sin and folly that they enervate and pollute this trust through their *παραδόσεις* and their *εργα*—a distinction maintained, likewise, in regard to the Jewish Church. That which is divinely entrusted, does not determine the worth or character either of the individual or the community, but the

self-active faithfulness, or unfaithfulness, maintained in regard to it. What is required of the faithful is, to preserve and defend the *κρίσις*, that which is the scriptural, the Christian and the original, and reject the opposing *παράδοσις* and *εργα* and keep separate and pure from them. When, however, a separation of this kind can no longer be effected, nor the Church purified, then comes the duty of personal withdrawal. For we must obey God rather than men.

d. The entrance into the world of such ecclesiastical disorders is, indeed, foretold in the Bible as an ecclesiastico-historical development, but they are not sanctioned as proper or just. They incur the judgment of God. All the testimonies of Scripture, in regard to, and against, the abuses and corruptions which, under the perverted use and misuse of Christian and ecclesiastical titles, manifest themselves, give an historical illustration of those parables in Matt. 13, but they, at the same time, condemn such disorders with an express and earnest call upon believers to purify and separate themselves from such elements. They must be regarded as foreign and antagonistic to the Church, and entitled to no Christian recognition. 1 Tim. 6 : 3—5 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 21 ; 3 : 5 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 1.

ARTICLE VII.

THE GERMAN COLONY AND LUTHERAN CHURCH IN MAINE.*

By Rev. HENRY N. POHLMAN, D. D., Albany, N. Y.

On Monday, the 7th of October, 1860, taking advantage of my usual vacation, I left my residence in Albany, to make a visit to one of the ancient Churches of our faith, in the far East. This church had been in connection with the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of New York, for nearly half a century. But its aged pastor, by reason of the distance, and his growing infirmities, had only occasionally been present at our annual conventions. He had

* An Address delivered before the Historical Society of the Lutheran Church, at its meeting in Washington, D. C., May 14th, 1869, and published by request of the Society.

now for some time been superannuated, and for two years his voice had been unheard in the sanctuary ; although, in his own humble dwelling, he still continued, from time to time, to minister to the spiritual wants of his beloved people.

But notwithstanding these ministrations, his flock were literally as sheep without a shepherd, and the consequences may be easily imagined. Some of the younger members, as is usual in towns situated on the coast, went down to the sea in ships, to behold God's wonders in the deep, and were lost to the Church. Many were scattered abroad in other directions, and being brought under stronger denominational influences, were gathered into other folds, so that only a feeble remnant remained.

But this remnant, "faithful among the faithless," remembering how in time past, they had taken sweet counsel together, and gone to the house of God in company, longed for the services of a minister, who could go in and out among them, to lead them into the green pastures, and by the still waters of God's ordinances, and to feed them with the bread of eternal life. These earnest longings were made known to the Ministerium, from time to time ; and at length, their persistent cry, that we should come over and help them, induced the Synod to appoint me as its representative to visit them, and by personal observation to ascertain their condition, and, if possible, to provide for their necessities.

In the fulfillment of this commission, I had left my pleasant home, and God having prospered me on my way; at the end of a three days journey, I found myself on the banks of the Muscongus, and in the humble dwelling of the aged Pastor.

Of that Pastor, and the people to whom he ministered, I would speak to you to-night ; and I trust that what I have to communicate of what I saw on that occasion ; and what I have since learned of the Lutheran Church in Maine, may serve to increase your veneration for those early pioneers of civilization and Christianity, though I despair to convey even a faint idea of the privations and sufferings of this excellent people, in their protracted struggle to found a colony, and establish the Church of their fathers, in those eastern wilds. But before I proceed with the history of the settlement of these colonists, it may be necessary to say a few words in relation to the country they had selected as their future home.

Almost midway between the mouth of the lovely Ken-

nebeck, and of that main artery of the lumber trade, the Penobscot, on what is now the line of Lincoln and Hancock counties, in the State of Maine, the ocean forms a deep and spacious Bay, appropriately named Broad. Into this Bay flows the little river Muscongus, on whose left bank stands the present town of Waldoborough. All the lands in this region, to the extent of thirty miles square, sterile in soil, though heavily wooded, were by original patent, dated March 2nd, 1630, granted by the Council of Plymouth to John Beauchamp of London, and Thomas Leverett of Boston, England. On the death of Beauchamp, Leverett succeeded to the estate. In 1719, John Leverett, who was then President of Harvard College, representing himself as sole heir of his grandfather, according to the English laws of primogeniture, came into possession of the whole patent.

But an emergency arising, Leverett associated with himself ten of his friends, and afterwards twenty others entered into the partnership, which gave the company the appellation of the Thirty Proprietors.

After the treaty of Utrecht, a difficulty arose which threatened the extinguishment of the claims of the Thirty Proprietors, in consequence of which they were induced to engage the services of Brig. Gen. Samuel Waldo, to effect an adjustment of the case. Proceeding to England, Waldo succeeded, by untiring application at court, in accomplishing the object of his mission; and, on his return, the Thirty Proprietors joined in surrendering to him, for his services, one-half of the patent.*

It was on these lands, originally called the Muscongus, and afterwards from the circumstances I have mentioned, the Waldo patent, and but a short distance from where Broad Bay spreads its ample bosom to the waters of the Atlantic, that a few German emigrants located in 1739. They were supposed to have come over in the summer, or autumn of that year, on board of a vessel which brought letters of marque and reprisal from the king of England, against the subjects of Spain.†

To the few families which composed the original settlement large accessions were made in 1740, when forty other families from Brunswick and Saxony, tempted by the im-

* Maine His. Soc. Collect. vol. VI, p. 321—322.

† Amer. Quar. Reg. vol. XIII, p. 162.

posing offers which the indefatigable Waldo, when in Europe had made and caused to be circulated in their language, arrived at Broad Bay. These settlers were unable to speak a word of the English language, and consequently could hold little intercourse, and gain but little aid from their English neighbors. They had been accustomed to seeing farms enclosed with fences; and were inexperienced in the clearing up of new lands. Their progress in agriculture was slow; their crops were injured by wild beasts, and the cattle that strayed from the neighboring settlements; and they suffered incredible hardships. They had been induced to leave Germany by the promise of one hundred acres of land; a supply of provisions for a given number of years; and the maintenance of a Gospel minister. They complained much of disappointment in these promises; for even when kept to the ear, they were broken to the hope. Their lots were laid out but twenty-five rods wide, and ran back into the wilderness two miles in length. This was an inconvenient shape for a farm, but they were easily reconciled to it at the time, as it brought their dwellings in close proximity. But the soil was hard, and covered with an unbroken forest, haunted by unknown beasts of prey, and strange and savage men.

There was then no fort, block house, or place of retreat in case of a hostile attack, no grist mill nearer than St. George's, or Damariscotta, to grind their scanty crops of "rochen," the only grain they raised, and which was generally prepared for cooking by merely bruising at home. Sighing for their fatherland, but unable to return, they despairingly lingered out the tedious years. But sad as was their present condition, greater evils were at hand. The war, in which England was then engaged with Spain, began now to assume an alarming aspect; and the growing apprehensions, that France was about to take sides with Spain in the contest, and the certainty that her subjects would persuade the Indians to join them, awakened fears, such as they never before experienced.

It is true, the Legislature of Massachusetts, of which Maine then formed a part, endeavored to prepare for the strife, by appropriating seventy-five pounds for the defence of Broad Bay. But this contributed but little to disperse the universal gloom, and soon their worst fears were real-

ized. France declared war on the 15th of March, 1744, and immediately commenced hostilities.*

War, always to be deprecated, becomes still more sanguinary when carried on by ignorant mercenaries, at all times eager for plunder, and delighting in blood. And it was against such foes the infant colony had to contend. Nor was it long before they felt the full measure of their vengeance. The Eastern and Canadian Indians taking sides with the French, as they usually did, fell upon the defenceless outpost, determined to extirpate the young settlement at a single blow. And they were but too successful in their assault. In the month of May, 1746, they made their stealthy approach; and soon a heap of ashes was all that remained of the habitations of the peaceful settlers, many of whom were cruelly murdered, while the remainder were carried away captive either to Canada, or into the forest fastnesses of their ruthless foes.

This savage act put an end, for the time, to the settlement of the Germans at Broad Bay, and the whole country in the neighborhood remained a barren waste, until after the treaty of peace at Aix la Chapelle, Oct. 7th, 1748. "About this time, the tragic story of the original settlers' fate, or some other incident, turned the thoughts of other Germans in the fatherland, towards the same region, as an abiding place. Sympathies have strong attractions, and the soil that had drunk in the blood of their martyred brethren, was to them consecrated ground."† So says the historian. But I am rather inclined to think that the flattering representations of Gen. Waldo, who was persistent in his attempts to settle his patent, had far more influence over the minds of the phlegmatic Germans than the blood of their martyred brethren. And I am confirmed in this opinion by the fact, that early in 1750 Mr. Crelleus, who is described as a "German gentleman," made a voyage across the Atlantic, it is said, "on an errand of enquiry;" but in reality to make terms for the proper settlement of his fellow countrymen.

On his arrival, he presented a memorial to the General Court of Massachusetts, in which he proposed to remove a considerable number of Protestant families from his own country to this, provided sufficient inducements were offer-

* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 61—62.

† Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 162.

ed, and a favorable prospect opened for their permanent establishment and prosperity. This encouragement was cheerfully afforded them.

In the following year (1751,) between twenty and thirty families came over with Mr. Etter their interpreter, among whom the earliest birth was that of Conrad Heyer, who at the time of my visit was still living, at the age of more than a hundred years, and of whom I shall have occasion to speak again before I conclude.

But the time of the arrival of this little colony was rather unfortunate, as they were landed on the sterile coast of Maine, in the latter part of the month of November, just as the severe winter of that climate was setting in. New England hospitality, however, provided them with both a welcome and a shelter. The General Court of Massachusetts with great unanimity passed an act, contributing to their necessities, and private charity was not remiss in its ministrations. Beds and bedding and other articles were liberally furnished to secure them from the inclemency of the weather, until the opening spring permitted them to reach their future home, and join the remnant of their brethren, who during the war, had fled with their families to the Fort at Louisburg for protection, but had now returned to their old possessions at Broad Bay, and on the banks of the Muscongus.

Thus, under more favorable auspices, was the German settlement at Waldoborough revived; and the future once more looked bright and promising.

Taking advantage of this hopeful beginning, General Waldo determined to persevere until he had secured the permanent establishment upon his patent of a large and flourishing community. To this end he sent his son to Germany, who published in the newspapers, and scattered, far and wide, a circular, offering the most flattering inducements to the simple-minded peasantry to emigrate to this modern El Dorado. A copy of this circular has lately come to light, and has been translated and published by the Maine Historical Society.* It is truly a remarkable document; and as rich in promises, as if it had emanated from the prolific brain of some wily emigrant runner of the

* Maine Hist. Soc. Collect. Vol. VI, pp., 329—30.

present day. After dwelling in magniloquent terms upon the desirableness of the location, the salubrity of the climate and the fertility of the soil, it provides to those who will of their own accord settle in Broad Bay, that they shall dwell together in certain divisions, consisting of one hundred and twenty families: and *promises*, that to every such district there shall be given to the church two hundred acres; to the first preacher settling among them, two hundred; to the school two hundred; and to each of the one hundred and twenty families one hundred acres, equal to more than one hundred and twenty German measurement. And this land, provided they dwell upon it seven years either in person, or by substitute, shall be guaranteed to them, their heirs and assigns forever; without their having to make the slightest recompense, or pay any interest for it. It provides that unmarried persons of twenty-one years and upwards, who embrace these offers, and venture to build upon their land, shall also receive one hundred acres, and be regarded as a family. Each district shall enjoy the protection of the laws; and so soon as it is organized, shall be entitled to send a deputy to the General Court. The colonists shall be obliged neither to bear arms nor carry on war, but in case war should arise, they would be protected by the government, and the free exercise of all Protestant religions will be guaranteed.

It promises, moreover, that there shall be given to the colonists on their arrival necessary support, for from four to six months, according as they arrive early or late in the season; and, furthermore, that if one or two Protestant preachers, having good testimonials, and unmarried, whose care is the salvation of souls, should resolve to trust to Providence, and the good will of Samuel Waldo, to go forth immediately with the rest, they shall receive, besides their free passage, a little supply of fifteen pounds sterling, out of the capital of the Company; and boards for the first church, which is to be built, shall also be given, and delivered to them.

It is further stated, that the first families going thither, although there should be several hundreds of them, they can all select their residences either in a sea-port. or on navigable rivers, where they can cut wood into cords for burning, or into timber for building material, and convey it to the shore, where it can always be taken of them by ships, for ready money, and carried to Boston, or other

cities; and from thence, whatever they need will be brought back in return, at a reasonable rate.

It considerably adds, in conclusion, that by these means the people will not only be able at once to support themselves, until the land is fit for cultivation, but, also, are freed from the trouble and expense of making wagons, and traveling by land, to which difficulties, it is well known Pennsylvania is subjected.

This imposing document is dated March 23rd, 1753, and published by authority of the Royal British Captain Waldo, hereditary Lord of Broad Bay, Massachusetts, and was soon followed by its desired results; for no less than sixty families immediately accepted its munificent offers; and we are told by the Hon. Wm. D. Williamson, the historian of Maine, that afterwards, as many as fifteen hundred Germans, encouraged by its representations, emigrated from time to time, and settled on the Patent of this self-styled hereditary Lord.

How his promises were fulfilled, is matter of history, and will be seen as we follow these sixty families to their destination. They arrived there in the month of September, and were put into a large shed, which had been erected near the shore. This shed was sixty feet long, without chimneys, and utterly unfit for human habitation; yet, here these destitute exiles, neglected by their patron, whose promises, in this instance, were wholly unfulfilled, dragged out a winter of almost inconceivable suffering. Many froze to death, many perished with hunger, or diseases, induced by their privations. The old settlers were too poorly supplied themselves, to afford much assistance to the new comers, who were fain to work for a quart of buttermilk a day; and considered it quite a boon, when they could gain a quart of meal for twelve or sixteen hours' work. They sought for employment, also, at Damariscotta and St. George's, and many of the children were put to service in those settlements. Some of them were not destitute of money, for it is a tradition, that of the three school masters, who emigrated with them, one was so wealthy and, in consequence, so arbitrary, that on any dispute arising, when arguments failed, he used to threaten to knock down his opponent with a bag of Johannes. But such was the scarcity of provisions, that even those, who had money, were unable to procure them. They were unacquainted, also, with hunting and fishing, for this, in their

own native land, had been the privilege of their Lords, and, therefore, they were unable to avail themselves of this source of supply.

Thus, in privation and suffering they passed the dreary winter months; and it was not until the following spring, that Waldo appointed an agent, Charles Leistner, to allot to them the promised lands, and deal out the provisions, which should have been distributed on their first arrival. Leistner was a man of education, exercised the powers of a magistrate, and should have protected them from imposition, but he did not entirely escape the murmurs of the settlers, who, in their privations and jealousy, accused him, perhaps without any foundation, of selling, for his own benefit, the provisions which had been furnished for them; and, in the allotment of their farms, he certainly treated them with great injustice. Instead of the hundred acres of land promised them on the sea coast, where wood would bring four shillings a cord, this agent took them back two miles into the heart of the wilderness, and there, perhaps, from fear of Indian hostilities, assigned them only a half an acre each, in a compact cluster. Here they were constrained to build their huts, carrying up boards, and covering their roofs with bark, in the best manner they were able.

But these evils were light, compared with the baptism of blood which awaited them, and which they were soon afterwards called upon to endure. For, scarcely had a year elapsed, when, in addition to their other discomforts, a band of Indians, instigated by the Romish French, fell upon the defenceless colonists, and the tomahawk and scalping knife did their bloody work. Many were barbarously slain, and others carried away captive. Little record remains of their individual sufferings, but any one, acquainted with the history of the period, knows how cruel were even the tender mercies of the Indians, and may easily imagine the untold horrors of their fate.

Such outrages led to the second French war, which was declared in June, 1756, during which, for seven long years, great hardships were endured by the colonists, and much distress occasioned by the want of provisions. Those who were able to do military duty, for the most part, enlisted under Jacob Leistner, who had been appointed Captain of a scouting party, and had charge of the stockade, or block-house, which had been erected for the defence of the set-

tlement. These were the favored ones, for they drew regular pay and rations, which formed the principle support for their families. But the great majority were left in extreme destitution. The *Annalist* tells us of one family, "who subsisted a whole winter on frost fish, with only four quarts of meal; and many a German woman was glad to do a hard day's work at planting or hoeing, for eight pence, or a quart of buttermilk.

And now, (February 10th, 1763,)

"Grim visag'd war had smoothed his wrinkled front,"

and "piping times of peace" returned, but not to the harassed colonists at Waldoborough. For scarcely had the din of battle died away, before this quiet and excellent people were perplexed with troubles from another, and entirely unexpected quarter. A flaw in the title to their lands had been discovered by some mousing speculator, and one of the evils, which so often befalls the unsuspecting emigrant, was now upon them, with all its distracting anxieties.

From the report of a Committee, to whom the matter had been referred, and which was adopted by the Legislature of Massachusetts, February 23rd, 1762, it appeared that Gen. Waldo (to say the least, and to put the most charitable construction upon his conduct,) labored under an erroneous impression, as to the extent of his Patent. Its true boundaries were the Penobscot on the East, and the Muscongus on the West; and, consequently, all the inhabitants on the western bank of the latter river (and these constituted the greater part of the colonists,) were without any title to their lands. True, they had deeds from General Waldo; but of what avail were these, when the General's right of ownership was invalidated. And now, what their enemies, the Indians, had spared, was liable to be taken from them by their so-called friends. They were about to loose, not only their farms, buildings and improvements, and be turned out of doors; but their Church property was in danger, for this, also, was on the litigated territory, as well as the humble temple in which they worshipped God, in the language, and after the time-honored custom of their fathers. In this dilemma, the troubled settlers, to the number of sixty or seventy families, purchased their lands anew, in 1763—64, and received other, and as they supposed satisfactory deeds from Mr. Thomas

Drowne, in behalf of the Pennaquid Company, which had established its title to them, under the patent granted by the Plymouth Council, to two merchants of Bristol, Robert Aldsworth and Gyles Elbridge, dated February 20th, 1631.

To the honor of this Company, it ought to be stated, that the settlers "were allowed to retain the lots assigned them by Waldo for public uses; and deeds were given them of one hundred acres for a meeting house; one hundred acres for the ministry; and one lot of twenty-five acres, and another of forty-one, for the support of schools."

But even this purchase did not avail to secure them quiet possession of their property. For, soon afterwards, "a possessary right," called "the Brown claim," was raised to the same lands, in virtue of ancient settlement and occupancy; and numerous depositions were taken to establish this title, to the no small alarm and perplexity of this honest and persecuted people.

Nor were the settlers on the other, or Eastern bank of the river, without serious trials and embarrassments. They had made improvements on certain portions of land within the acknowledged Waldo patent, but, either through ignorance or inadvertency, had obtained no deeds from the General before his sudden death from apoplexy near Fort Pownal, in 1759, and were, therefore, seriously molested by his heirs, who claimed under him, among whom was General Knox, who afterwards became so famous during our Revolutionary struggle. Thus were these honest, unsuspecting Germans harrassed by the harpies of the law, contrary to every principle of justice and good faith, and left, with no remedy for their grievances, and without the least remuneration or indemnity for their losses.

Justly indignant at such persistent ill-treatment and injury, disappointed in their expectations, displeased with the climate, and determined to be rid of interminable law-suits, it is no wonder that a large number of families resolved to abandon the settlement and to seek for a more desirable residence. Accordingly many of the settlers sold their estates for what they would bring, (which, in many instances, was but a miserable pittance,) and, in 1773, removed from Maine to join their German brethren, who three years before, under the advice and guidance of the Rev. Mr. Cilly, a Moravian clergyman, had emigrated to Carolina, and effected a settlement in that more genial

clime. By this emigration, according to two authorities,* the colony lost not less than three hundred families, including many of its most skilful husbandmen, and estimable citizens. It is hardly credible, however, that so many could have been spared, at so early a period, without depopulating the place. But, whether this account be exaggerated or not, the loss was soon made up. For the Germans, like the rest of the Teutons, are a clannish race, and upon "a second serious, sober thought," many of them concluded that it was far better to retrace their steps and "bear the ills they had," than to remain among comparative strangers, and "suffer others that they knew not of," especially as the rumblings of the storm, which was soon to burst upon the Colonies, were now beginning to be heard. The great majority of them, therefore, returned, though the expense incurred, and the loss of time, had greatly increased their indigence. But they were received with joyful hearts, and many a helping hand was extended towards them, as they quietly settled down again amongst their former friends and neighbors.

During the struggle which led to the separation of the Colonies from the mother country, which shortly followed, they bore their part manfully, and endured, in common with the rest of the colonists, their full share of the privations and sufferings incident to a state of warfare, though they were not, as on former occasions, subject to the incursions of the Indians. And when peace dawned upon the land, they cheerfully returned to their usual avocations, and busily occupied themselves in the tilling of the soil. For they were essentially a farming community, and but few had as yet turned their attention to any, save the most common of the mechanic arts.

Hitherto, the settlement had consisted principally of Germans, and of the children who were born unto them. But after the close of the war of the Revolution, the facilities for ship building, afforded by the Muscongus river, and its vicinity to the waters of the Broad Cove and Bay, began to attract the attention of the descendants of the Puritans, a proverbially active and enterprising race, and soon a village sprang into existence, at the head of navigation on the eastern bank, and the population became materially changed. But the Germans still adhered to

* Holmes' Amer. An. Williamson His. Ma.

their own language, and to the customs of their fathers, and particularly to their ancient faith. They were originally from different parts of Germany, and consisted for the most part of those who adopted the Augsburg Confession for their creed; but among them were many of the followers of Zwinglius, and some few of the Moravians, or United Brethren. But they were all of one mind, as to the necessity of establishing public worship, and paying a due regard to the institutions of Christianity; and, therefore, no sooner had they erected their huts, than they endeavored to provide a fit habitation for the mighty God of Jacob. This humble temple was built of logs, occupied a central position near the Cove, and was furnished with all the conveniences their scanty resources could supply. Here, though destitute of a regular clergyman, they constantly assembled from Sabbath to Sabbath, for public worship. At these meetings, John Ulmer, one of the principle men among them, took the lead, and acted as their minister, and as such was paid by Waldo, until the settlement was broken up by the incursion of the Indians in 1746. Upon the revival of the colony three years later, he continued to labor in the same vocation, and after the death of Leistner, he appears to have acted in the triple capacity of priest, prince and military commander. Of the distinction thus conferred upon him he was not a little vain; nor was he slow in asserting his claims, and in exacting on all occasions due honor and respect. For, we are told, that visiting the neighboring settlement of Pennaquad, towards the close of the second French war, and hailing the people in the dusk of the evening to set him across the river, in answer to the inquiry who he was, he gave his name with such a string of titles, that they expected to find a large number of persons; and were much disappointed when they found all these honors borne by a single individual.*

This state of things continued until 1762, when the Rev. John Martin Schaeffer, who is described, I know not on what authority, as belonging to the German Lutheran Church, came from New York to Boston, and was invited by some of the inhabitants of Broad Bay to become their pastor; and John Ulmer's occupation, as the ministerial office, was gone. But from all accounts the mild government and harmless vanity of the one was but ill exchanged

* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 115.

for the bold exactions and mean selfishness of the other; for according to the concurrent testimony of the period, Schaeffer's "character was not so adorned with graces, as to entitle his portrait to a place among the apostles of rectitude and reform."*

Shortly after his arrival, he organized a church in two branches, Lutheran and German Reformed. This church consisted of sixty or seventy communicant members, each of whom contributed to his support, in addition to the use of the glebe, three pounds old tenor, a bushel of corn, and two days work annually. He also, received, according to the custom of those primitive times, (a custom not altogether extinct in some of our German congregations, even to the present day,) half a dollar for the baptism of each child; a like sum for each person confirmed; and a dollar for attending every funeral. But not satisfied with his income as a minister, he practised as a physician also, and gained much fame, as well as wealth, by letting blood, applying blisters, and physicing the public generally. He was applied to, by numbers from the neighboring towns, and was considered by the common people everywhere, as having no equal. He made his people believe it was necessary to be bled every spring, for which he received a regular fee of fifty cents for each inhabitant. These emoluments, with such advantages as his property, influence and education, enabled him to take, in making bargains, soon rendered him opulent. And as the love of lucre grows by what it feeds on, he was no longer content with the profits derived from preaching and the practice of medicine; but engaged in navigation, receiving the lumber and wood of the illiterate Germans, on commission, to sell in Boston, and always taking out his own demands from the proceeds, and liquidating the amounts in his own way. Many a poor man had to work a week for him, to pay for the annual loss of blood in himself and family; and when any considerable sickness occurred, a sloop's hold, full of wood went to pay the doctor's bill. As his wealth increased, all restraint was thrown off, and his vices appeared without a blush. He was very profane, grew intemperate, and though an eloquent preacher, gradually lost all influence as a minister. But this gave him little, or no concern;

* Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 164.

for when remonstrated with, by his people, for his improper behaviour, he was accustomed to excuse himself by saying: "When I have my plack coat on, den I am a minister, and you must do as I *say*, but when I have my green coat on, den I am a toctor, and I can do as I please."*

Thus, did this wolf in sheep's clothing continue to fleece, with impunity, his defenceless flock. "But the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment." And it may be mentioned, as a striking instance of retributive justice, that while residing in the neighboring town of Warren, to which he removed in after years, and where he continued his medical practice, and in addition, took out a license to retail spirituous liquors, for which he himself was the best customer. His house, during his temporary absence in Boston, was entered in the dead of night, by four men in disguise, who seized the women, the only inmates, pinioned their arms, confined them in the cellar, broke open the chests and closets, containing his hoards of silver and gold, and stripped him of all his ill-gotten gains. Every attempt to discover the burglars, or to recover the stolen treasure, was unavailing; and the miserable wretch, in rage and despair, plunging still deeper into intemperance, died as the fool dieth, and "made no sign."†

It is said this miserable man was pastor of the church for nearly twenty years; but it is hardly credible, that the great body of the congregation, should have endured his ministrations so long, and it is more than probable, that the number of his adherents was but few. Indeed, it is matter of record, that in 1767, the Rev. Mr Cilly, a pious Moravian clergyman, came from Germany to Broad Bay, who, being a more spiritual-minded man, and exemplifying in his life and conduct the reality of the doctrine he preached, drew away and converted to the Moravian faith many of the settlers, who, in 1770, removed with him to Carolina, and joined a similar society there.‡ And we have positive testimony, that the church was without a pastor in 1774.

Among the old documents at Hartwick Seminary, there is a call, dated May 28th, 1774, addressed to the Rev.

* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 116—17.

† April 20th, 1794.

‡ Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 134.

John Christopher Hartwick, *pro tem.* pastor of the church at Boston, and superintendent of sundry Evangelical congregations, scattered up and down in America ;" which describes the church at Waldoborough, as being "like sheep without a shepherd, destitute of the ministry of the Gospel, and scattered, and fainting for want of spiritual pasture, to the great detriment of its spiritual state." It moreover informed him, that he had been unanimously elected pastor, and earnestly entreated him to become their spiritual guide. Nay, so anxious were the people to secure the services of a pastor, that they furthermore empowered Hartwick, in the event of his being unable to accept their call, to select any person whom he should deem suitable for the position, and unanimously agreed to abide by his decision. In compliance with this call, it is known that Hartwick visited Waldoborough, and performed ministerial duties there in July 1774, but whether he remained with them for any length of time, is extremely doubtful, as he was proverbially fond of change. At any rate, there is no further record of his ministry.

The next we hear of the congregation, is in 1785, when a Mr. Croner appears to have been its pastor. But during his ministry, which continued four years, no progress was made in the life of godliness, and nothing accomplished for the Redeemer's kingdom; for, according to the record, "he was an evil example to his flock, a reproach to the ministry, and an injury to souls."* Whether this Croner was ever regularly inducted into the ministry, is extremely problematical; and from all accounts he appears to have been one of that class of imposters, with which our Church has been so much cursed in the past, and from which every lover of our Zion ought earnestly to pray, that she may be delivered in the future.

But Providence had better things in store for this long suffering, and oft deceived people. Taught by bitter experience, not to trust in every adventurer, who represented himself to be a Lutheran minister, they sought advice from the Synod of Pennsylvania, and thereby obtained the services of a pastor, who more than compensated them for all the disappointments of the past. For the Rev. August Ferdinand Rity, who, upon the recommendation of that Synod, was called in 1795, was not only a man of piety

* Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 164.

and learning, but, unlike his predecessors, had the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom much at heart, and was deeply imbued with the love of souls. He was a native of Germany, and educated at the University of Helmstadt; had been in this country about a year, during which, he was pastor of four small congregations, within the bounds of the Pennsylvania Synod, of which he was a member; and now undertook to serve the church at Waldoborough, for the annual salary of two hundred and twenty dollars, and the use of a hundred acres of land. Like his predecessors, he preached in the German language exclusively, and when first called upon by the neighboring clergy, being unacquainted with the English, was able to converse with them only in Latin; though afterwards, as he became better acquainted with this country, and its institutions, he was one of the few German ministers, who had the good sense to advise his parishioners to abandon their German schools, and give their children an English education; and had his sensible advice been followed, we should not have been obliged to record, to night, the decline and final extinction of the Lutheran Church in Maine. It is said, by his cotemporaries, that Mr. Rity was remarkably sedate in his deportment, and rarely indulged in anything that would excite a smile; and that the nearest approach to levity he ever exhibited, was in the case of Mr. Demuth, one of his parishioners. This man had in some way taken offence at his pastor, (a common occurrence in ministerial experience,) and refused to speak to him. Mr. Rity, in company with a friend, passing him one day, in the usual manner, without receiving a nod, the friend observed: "There goes Mr. Demuth." "Nein, Nein," said the minister, nicht Meister Demuth, Meister *Hochmuth*."* But this was an exception, for otherwise he was

"Affectionate in look

And tender in address, as well became

A messenger of grace to guilty men—"

"Much impress'd

Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,

And mainly anxious that the flock he fed

Should feel it too."

And much did he need these gifts and graces, for he had

* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 271.

hard work to perform, many thorns and briers to remove, and a field to cultivate, which had long lain waste, and brought forth no fruit unto righteousness. But he was fully qualified for the task, and he labored not alone, for God was with him, and gave him many souls for his hire, and as his crown of rejoicing. He was only too soon removed from the toils of his spiritual husbandry on earth, to reap the glorious rewards of the heavenly harvest home. For he suddenly expired, after a sixteen years' ministry, in 1811; and devout men, with saddened hearts, carried him to his burial, universally lamented by all who knew him, both Americans and Germans, leaving behind a reputation, as his biographer quaintly remarks: "Like an array of gems which never fade."

And, now, the widowed church was again without a pastor, but she did not sit long overwhelmed with grief, bemoaning her desolate condition; for God heard her cry, and sent her in the autumn of 1812, and in the person of the Rev. John William Starman, a teacher to go before her, as a pillar of cloud and of fire, to direct her by day and by night. The aged German Christians of Waldoborough, hailed his coming with delight, and wept for joy, that once more before their death, they could sit and listen in their own language, to the words of heavenly wisdom, to edify their minds, and kindle into new life their religious zeal. I said, the *aged German Christians*; for, alas, the younger members of their families, for want of English preaching, had generally joined the Congregational church, which had been gathered by the new comers in 1807, under the ministry of the Rev. John R. Cutting. But the old settlers, and some few of their immediate descendants, were a staid generation, not excitable, or effected by what they denominated new-light doctrine and preaching, and imagined that they could not understand the preaching of the Gospel in any other than the German language. Hence, they insisted on the suicidal policy, to have all the services of the church exclusively in German, making no provision for the firstlings of the flock, who, by association with their English-speaking neighbors, had gradually lost the knowledge of their mother tongue; and who, by this policy, were constrained, if they desired spiritual food, to leave the ancient fold, and feed in other pastures. Under these circumstances, it was impossible to infuse a younger and more vigorous element into the slumbering and dying

energies of the Church; and Mr. Starman was destined to labor comparatively in vain, and to spend his strength for naught.

But one thing he was enabled to do. From the first organization of the church, the Lutherans and German Reformed, who composed it, were accustomed to have the Lord's Supper administered to them separately. Though this did not accord with his views of Christian communion, he nevertheless continued the custom, for the sake of peace and harmony; always, however, giving a pressing invitation to the different parties to discard their prejudices, and lovingly to unite in partaking of the sacred feast. At first, few complied with the invitation, but the number gradually increased, until on the 17th of June, 1829, the separating wall was entirely taken away. At a meeting of the church members, held at that period, it was unanimously resolved, that the different parties would hereafter commune together, according to a prescribed form; and from that time forward, both classes approached the Lord's table together, as one undivided family, in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bonds of peace.

A citizen of Waldoborough describes one of these joyful occasions, which must have been peculiarly interesting and impressive. He speaks of the "tottering monuments of the early days, of the first settlers of Broad Bay," surrounding the sacramental board—of Conrad Heyer, who for more than seventy years, occupied a conspicuous seat in the singing gallery, both in the old log meeting house, at the Cove, and then at the church now dilapidated and in ruins, about three quarters of a mile from the village,"*—but he says nothing of those, who in the bud and blossom of their years, had consecrated themselves to the service of the Master—for alas, they were not there with their parents, to eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. And how can a church flourish, when the natural sources of its increase and vitality are cut off? For though the pastor had now, for some time, been permitted to preach occasionally in English, yet from his imperfect knowledge of the language, the want of fluency in the delivery of his sermons, or some other cause, he failed to attract the young, though they universally respected him, or to bring any of the wanderers back again into the ancient fold.

* Maine His. Soc. Collec., vol. V. p. 409.

The Rev. Mr. Starman, was a man of faith, and a man of prayer, but he could not work miracles; and little short of a miracle could save the decaying church at Waldo-borough, from the dissolution which awaited it.

My first acquaintance with this man of God, was at the Synod of our Ministerium, in August, 1823. He was then upwards of fifty years of age, unmarried, and so bashful and diffident, that he avoided rather than sought the society of the gentler sex; and probably he would have gone through life, wanting that blessing of the Lord, *a good wife*, but for the intervention of his congregation; who, believing that it was not good for him to be alone, and that his efficiency as a pastor would be increased, by his having a *helpmeet* from among the daughters of the land, took the matter into their own hands so completely, as not only to designate who should be his bride, but also, to negotiate with her family and herself, as to the terms and conditions of the marriage.* And though "matrimony is a matter of more worth than to be dealt in by attorneyship," he cheerfully acquiesced in the arrangement, and in due time, the parties, to their mutual satisfaction, were firmly united in the silken tie.

This, no doubt, contributed greatly to his usefulness at the time, and, as I can testify from personal observation, was a source of comfort and happiness to him, in his declining years. And much did he need careful nursing and kind attention in his old age. For I found him a perfect wreck of his former self, afflicted with erysipelas, almost blind, and nearly helpless; yet, the same simple-hearted, prayerful, God-fearing, and God-loving man as ever. Never shall I forget the gleam of joy, which illumined his aged countenance, as I alighted from the stage coach, and entered his humble dwelling. His troubles now seemed to be over, the desire of his heart to be gratified. His people were once more to be gathered in the old church, and to hear the Gospel from the lips of a Lutheran minister. Immediate arrangements were made for religious services, on every day of the limited period of my visit. On Friday evening I preached in a neighboring school house; and such an audience of aged men and women, my eyes had never before beheld. At the close of the services, which were listened to with rapt attention, they clus-

* Maine His. Soc. Collec., vol. V. p. 409.

tered round me, and had I been the President of the United States, I could not have received a more hearty greeting, while they hailed with joy the proposition I made, in behalf of the Ministerium, that we would send them a minister, provided they would aid in his support, by the contribution of one hundred and fifty dollars annually. On the following afternoon I addressed the congregation again, at the house of Conrad Hoyer, the first born among the settlers at Broad Bay, who, although one hundred and one years old, was as brisk and active as a man of fifty; and who, according to his wont, for more than eighty years, acted as chorister, and led us in a hymn of praise, reading without spectacles the small print of Watts' duodecimo Hymn Book, and singing even the highest notes, with scarcely any of the tremulousness of age. But Sunday was the great day of the feast; for all the settlers far and near, to the third and fourth generations, crowded to the dilapidated church, on foot, and in all kinds of ancient vehicles. The aged pastor was there wrapped in flannels, having been carefully conveyed thither by one of his attentive deacons—the little remnant of his flock was there, ancient men and women not a few, having for the most part passed three score years and ten, fondly recalling the days of their youth, when they kept holy day together, and had gone to the house of God in company. After two services in the old church, and a third, in the Baptist meeting house in the village, the congregation was dismissed to meet on Monday afternoon, to listen to another sermon, and learn the result of the effort which was being made to comply with my proposition, and secure the services of a minister. At that meeting it was announced, that the committee appointed for that purpose, after the most strenuous efforts, had been able to secure only between fifty and sixty dollars; and the amount of a collection taken on the spot, for my expenses, which they insisted on defraying, was only one dollar and thirty-one cents. It was not, that they did not desire the services of a Gospel minister. It was not because they were penurious; for I doubt not, that each one subscribed to the full extent of his ability. But it was because, for the most part, they were almost entirely destitute of the means of comfortable living, and had absolutely nothing to spare from their scanty earnings.

Under these circumstances, as the feeble few were una-

ble to supply even the necessary clothing for a pastor, and as there was no material in the settlement which might be counted on for the resuscitation and growth of the congregation, they came to the unanimous conclusion to disband their organization, and seek a spiritual home in the neighboring Congregational Church, where since the disability of their pastor they had been fed, and in whose communion many of their children were already numbered. Though with great reluctance, I could not but acquiesce in their decision; and commending them to God and to the word of his grace, the parting prayer was offered, the farewell hymn sung, and we separated, to meet no more, until assembled

“Where congregations ne’er break up
And Sabbaths ne’er shall end!”

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since that memorable visit, and time has wrought its usual changes. That aged pastor, who died in 1854, in his eighty-second year, and that ancient band of pilgrims, who clung to him to the last, have all gone to join the general assembly and church of the first born; whose names are written in heaven. The afflicted minister’s agonizing prayers for his people are turned into joyful songs of praise for their deliverance from these earthly tabernacles, and their exaltation to the city which hath foundations, and the house not made with hands—Old Conrad Heyer, clothed in immortal youth, is singing the song of Moses and the Lamb—and nothing remains on earth to mark the place of their sojourn, and the Church of our fathers in the State of Maine, but the dilapidated ruins of the house, in which they once worshipped God—and the tall marble column in the neighboring graveyard, erected by the noble liberality of the citizens of Waldoborough, which tells the passing traveller, that *Here lie the remains of the sainted Rity and Starman, the once able and efficient pastors of the German Lutheran Church of Broad Bay!*

Gentlemen and Brethren of the Historical Society! This painful history, will not have been presented to you in vain, if we will only learn the important lessons which it teaches: How utterly futile is the attempt to build up a little Germany in America.

How surely an isolated church, using exclusively the German language, surrounded by an English speaking population, and receiving no accessions from the Fatherland, must die out in the course of three or four generations. And above all

How absolute is the necessity of a perfect union and communion of the German and English element, in our ecclesiastical councils, if we would attain to that position in this land, which of right to us belongs as the first pure Protestant Church of the Reformation. For this union I have always contended. This has been one of the objects of my life and labors. This should be the burden of our prayers, before the throne of heavenly grace. And though late developments in our beloved Zion, may seem to have deferred this desirable event, it will come. It *must* come, or the Lutheran Church in the United States will be numbered, like the Church in the State of Maine, among "the things that were."

ARTICLE VIII.

THE SPECIAL MISSION OF THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY; ITS PRINCIPLES AND ITS INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES.*

By Rev. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, A. M., Pittsburgh, Pa.

It is not necessary, on this occasion, to discuss the power of the press, "the theme of so many declamations and commonplaces, but to whose merits and effect, no com-

* After the delivery of the Address at the Anniversary of the Publication Society, at the late meeting of the General Synod, in Washington, a resolution was adopted, requesting a copy of the Address, for publication in the *Evangelical Review*. The author is unable to comply strictly with this resolution, because, at the time of its delivery, only a part of the Address was written. As here published, some things may be added, which were not originally in the Address, while others may be omitted. The substance, however, is the same.

monplaces, or declamations, will ever be able to do justice." Nor is it necessary to prove the necessity of the Publication Society, since this is acknowledged by all. The organization that wants to live and grow, must publish and defend its views. No one doubts, that this Society has a general aim and mission, namely : to publish and circulate religious books. But some are not fully conscious of the fact, that, as a Church, we have a special mission, which is, also, the mission of our Publication Society. That the mission of this Society is in harmony with the principles of the General Synod, is evident from the second article of the Constitution: "This Society, assuming the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, shall have for its object, the diffusion of religious knowledge, by means of translations and religious productions, and thus to furnish, and circulate a suitable literature for our Church."

Physical and intellectual power is, in itself, neither good nor bad ; it is the motive that lies back of the power, and controls it, which determines its moral character. It is the choice of an aim for life, either in harmony with God's aim, or contrary thereto, that consecrates, or curses a man's faculties. Every Society, if there is any reason for its existence, and if it is really a unity, whatever may be its variety, has, like the individual, a conscience, a law, a motive, a sphere of operation, and a mission ; and these determine its character. And as every person has a peculiar mission, for which he is specially adapted, and to which he, and he only is called, and which no one else can perform ; so every Society should have a special reason for its existence, and a peculiar mission. If any two Societies have exactly the same mission, then they should cease to be two, by being united into one Society, so that by their union, their power to accomplish the mission might be increased. The Lutheran Publication Society has a peculiar mission ; and it was organized, because it was felt, that there is for it a work, which can be done by no other existing organization. It is its mission, that makes it either important, or insignificant ; and in order that the worth of the Society may be known, we must have a clear idea of its mission.

The great German theologian Schleiermacher said, that he did not so much regard it as his business to teach people something new, as to make them realize that which was already in them. And whilst discussing this mission, it

shall not be my aim to say anything new, but to make you conscious of that which is already in you.

The Lutheran Publication Society is the preacher of the General Synod. Through it, the Synod declares its principles to the Church, and to the world. It aids the minister, by instructing him, and by assisting him to enlighten his people. But mere general enlightenment cannot be the great aim of the Society, for then it would have no special mission, since this is more or less the aim of every Publication Society. Nor can its special aim be to spread religious literature of a general character among our people, for, that could be done as well, and perhaps, more cheaply, by other Societies. But its special aim is, to do what no other Society can, to make our principles familiar to all, and to provide a literature that naturally springs from these principles, and harmonizes with them.

The character, the worth, and the inherent power of a Society, are not dependent on the area of territory occupied, nor on the number of persons embraced in the Society, nor on the amount of money it commands; but on the principles underlying the Society, and a faithful adherence to them. Not where it is, not how great a show it makes, not the number of its advocates, but *what* it is, determines the character of the Publication Society. The principles of an organization are its essence; and in proportion as these are living and life-giving, will the organization be vigorous, or weak.

If, as a Church, we have a special work to perform, then this Society, also, has a special mission, for it is the outgrowth and the exponent of the Church. And that our Church has a special mission, only the superficial observer will undertake to deny. Whilst we have much in common with other Evangelical Churches, we nevertheless occupy a position, that makes us distinct and peculiar. In government, in ceremonies, and even in doctrine, we are, in many respects, similar to other Churches; but, that which distinguishes us from them, is a great fundamental principle, which lies back of all form, and ceremony, and government, and doctrine. With Luther, we adhere strictly to the word of God, as the supreme authority; but with him we also insist, that this supremacy of Scripture must not be destroyed practically, by making its interpretation depend on human authority. With Luther, too, we aim, not to establish, or perpetuate a sect, or mere denomi-

nation, but to restore and perpetuate the Church itself, the Church established by Jesus and his Apostles. Therefore, we claim, that the basis of the Church, the Christian Church, is broad enough, and narrow enough for us, without enlarging it, as is done by some systems of infidelity, without contracting it, as is done by sectarianism. We want the conditions of fellowship to be the same as those made by Christ and his Apostles; and we cannot believe, that to be the true Church, which makes conditions of fellowship, which exclude any person whom Christ receives as a disciple. In this respect we stand with the Church of the Reformation, before bitter contention rent it into factions, and sectarianized the Evangelical Church. Luther aimed to reform the Church, and, therefore, he tried to restore the basis of the Church itself, on which all must stand, who are Christians. He did not aim to establish a mere sect, which would require a basis narrower than that of the Church, and would necessarily exclude some who belonged to the Church of Christ. As children and heirs of the Reformation, we claim all the rights and privileges claimed by the Church of the Reformation, whether they be positive or negative, constructive or destructive—the aim always being to build up the Church of Christ. If truths have been hid, they must be brought to light again; if their growth has been checked, it must again be promoted; if errors have been promulgated, they must be exposed and rejected; if abuses are practiced, though association and antiquity may have made them dear, they must be reformed. This work was not finished by the Reformers, but it was commenced by them; they did not do our work, but they prepared the way for it, and teach us how to do it, just as they do not interpret the Bible for the Christian, but give him the Gospel, and teach him how to interpret it for himself. A Church, which has only the doctrinal results of the Reformation, which it treasures as an unchangeable possession, may be called a Reformed Church; but a Church, which has, also, the spirit and the principles of the Reformation, must necessarily be a reformatory Church. To be still more explicit, we must say, that the Reformation did not produce a Church perfectly reformed, but it produced a reformatory Church, which was to continue unceasingly the work of reformation already begun. And Churches now prove glaringly, their departure from the principles of the Reformation, by

clinging only to doctrines that have been handed down from age to age, while they totally ignore, or explicitly reject the reformatory spirit and principles, which made the Reformation what it was. If the Reformation finished what it commenced, so that its life became petrified into a dead system, that can be transmitted from age to age, then we are not the children and heirs of the Reformation, and do not desire to be. But if it commenced a work of ceaseless progress, then we claim to be of the Reformation; and we legitimate our claim by the fact, that we are a reformatory Church, with the principles that were the law of the great Reformation, and with the spirit and life that were its inspiration.

It is, indeed, true, that the highest Christian consciousness of the age is with us. The most spiritual and the most clear-sighted Christians of all Churches acknowledge our fundamental principle, that there are certain essential doctrines, on which unity is demanded by Christ and his Apostles, that on other non-essential doctrines, liberty must be granted, a liberty that is essential to the Church, to keep it from sectarianism; and that the Church has no more right to make a basis for fellowship, narrower than Christ made, than it has a right to make a basis broader, than that made by him. "Other foundations can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" and this foundation is as essentially destroyed by contraction as by expansion. And the most advanced of the various Christian Churches practice this principle, laid down in our basis, whatever their creeds may say. The Presbyterian Church no more binds to non-essentials in its creed, than does the Lutheran Church; if it did, the Church would be still more shattered than it is, and it would be as inefficient in life, as extreme Calvinism is in the pulpit. The same is true of the Episcopal and other Churches. But, I believe, that ours is the first Church in this country, which declared agreement in fundamentals, and liberty in non-fundamentals, to be, not merely a practical rule, but a principle—a principle that is essential to the Church, to distinguish it from sectarianism. We thus have a basis, which none can stand on but a Christian, and on which every Christian must stand. With this principle, the problem for us to solve is, how the most perfect unity can be secured in the greatest diversity, consistent with Christianity;

and how with true Gospel liberty, we can form the most compact organization.

Those who understand our position, need not be told, that our liberty is not licentiousness, and that our principles do not lead to confused eclecticism, or religious chaos, but to systematic growth. Our position is strongly Protestant, and has not proved a failure. But many professors of the Protestant religion have failed to grasp its principles, and consistently practice them. The remedy is not in abandoning them, but in returning to them.

With our basis, we can be orthodox, and still be evangelical; we can be consistent advocates of principle, without being intolerant; we can be Lutherans, and distinct from all other Churches, and still can extend the hand of Christian fellowship to every brother in Christ; we can be churchly without being sectarian, and can be the more churchly because we are not sectarian; we make the true basis of the Church ours, and on this basis we are immovably fixed, but we can, at the same time, adopt all that is true and good in others; we can adopt the principles of the Reformers, and can adapt them to our age and necessities; and, in the nineteenth century, we can stand with Christ, and protest with the Reformers, without putting new wine into old bottles, and without sewing new cloth on old garments.

With principles that are peculiar, with a peculiar history, with a peculiar sphere of labor, our Church, and with it our Publication Society, has a special mission, which is co-extensive with these principles, and with this sphere. In opposition to Rationalistic and Pantheistic tendencies, we advocate genuine Christianity, and profess our faith in a God who, is both living and personal, who hears and answers prayer, who reconciles a world to Himself, through his Son, and who gives his children the inspiration of His Spirit. In opposition to an orthodoxy, which makes faith consist in an intellectual assent to dogmas, mathematically fixed, and frozen into a rigid mass, we advocate a faith, that lies back of head and heart and will, and controls all, making the man faithful; a faith, that apprehends Christ, and that has his life; that gives creeds their true value, by destroying their fictitious authority, and that prizes God's word too highly, to allow ages to heap rubbish on it, and thus destroy its purity and power. In opposition to the chronic tendency to make forms and cere-

monies valuable for their own sake, and thus give them undue prominence, we claim, that they are but the organ of the Spirit and the truth, and; that consequently, they are valuable only in so far as they convey Spirit and truth, without which, they are as cumbrous and lifeless as a dead body. In opposition to the prevailing tendency to legality and Pharisaic letter-worship, we advocate a spirituality which recognizes God as a Spirit, and worships Him in spirit and in truth. In opposition to sentimental cant on the union of all Christians, we claim, that the Church of Christ has always been one, and can never be otherwise; that consequently, there is already organic unity in the Church, as that of the branches in the vine, though this unity is not visible, but spiritual. To the superficial, sensational, spasmodic excitement in religion, we oppose the deep and lasting truth of God's word. We want the doctrine, that is God's doctrine, and the orthodoxy, that is synonymous with evangelical piety. We want life; but instead of animal, or artificial excitement; we want the genuine revival wrought by God's Spirit operating through God's word. What is doctrine for the head, must be emotion for the heart, must be impulse for the will, and must be our life. In a word, as the Church of the Reformation, we must apply the principles of the Reformation, and of Protestantism to the present. This means, that it is our mission to make central and primary, what Christ and his Apostles made such, and that all besides must be made secondary, or else must be rejected. And the centre of all is Christ himself—not his word, not his work—but Christ himself, who is more than these and includes them.

So powerful are our principles, that many who have gone out from us, pretending to repudiate them, in spite of themselves practice these principles. And, we cannot doubt, that these are the principles of the future. We must pass away; denominations and institutions may cease to exist; the name of our Church may become a matter of history, rather than a living reality; but the principles we have adopted, must finally prevail. Gradually the denominations will work up to them, and will recognize in them the truth of the Gospel. To expound these principles and to spread them, and to give the Church a literature in harmony with them, that is the special mission of the Lutheran Publication Society. As our principles and

our mission are peculiar, we should also have a literature that is peculiar, and is the outgrowth of these principles. This does not, however, prevent the publication of religious works of a general character, since, besides our peculiarities, we have so much in common with other Churches. But we need books that give an exposition of our basis; we want a review, a monthly, and weeklies in the English, German, and Scandinavian languages, which are true to these principles, which have character in them, and character back of them, and from which proceeds a virtue to those that come in contact with them, and which, while they breathe the spirit of love that was in Jesus, have also, his boldness and firmness. Either let us abandon our position, or else like true men defend it to the utmost.

“Be thou like the first apostles,
Be thou like the heroic Paul ;
If a great thought seek expression,
Speak it boldly, speak it all.

Face thine enemies, accusers,
Scorn the prison, rack, and rod ;
And if thou hast truth to utter,
Speak, and leave the rest to God.”

Being called to a mission of such vast importance, the question naturally arises, what are our intellectual resources for the accomplishment of this mission?

In this country our Church occupies a vast mission field, and we, more than any other Church, ought to have a missionary spirit. The proportion of those that are nominally Lutherans, to the ministers in our Church, is larger than that of any other denomination. Under such circumstances it is natural, that our energies should be directed chiefly to the practical work. The constantly increasing, and daily ripening harvest, is greater than we can reap. But the time has come, when a church literature is an absolute necessity, a literature; that will not interfere with our missionary work, but will aid us in performing it. And though we have heretofore accomplished but little in this respect; though the draught on our practical energies has been such, as to leave but little time, and perhaps, less inclination for literary labors, still, I confidently assert, that we have resources for the development of a church literature, which are not surpassed by any Church. We have

at our command, untold literary treasures, which, however, like hoarded gold, are unused. We have not only intellect in our Church that might be made productive, and the usual resources of other Churches, but we have also, the vast treasures of German science and literature, as peculiarly ours, from which we can draw. Those who have investigated the matter know, that the literature of no other Church, is as rich as that of the Lutheran Church of Germany. It is a mine, in which all the denominations have quarried, and some have therefrom accumulated more wealth than our Church in this country. Let us frankly acknowledge it; we have impoverished ourselves by neglecting that mine. I met in German Universities, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Episcopalians from this country, but not one who was connected with the General Synod of the Lutheran Church.

One reason why these treasures are not made more available to our Church is, that so many false notions respecting German theological science prevail. Many regard it with so much suspicion, that they never investigate it sufficiently to learn its real character. We are not to enter blindly the richest field of theological literature and appropriate the first works we stumble on, but we are to select carefully, and appropriate cautiously. Only such works ought to be translated, as are really valuable. Like real thinkers, we should master the material we select and assimilate it, working it into our system and life. Our principles give us the law for making our selections and appropriations. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Some are apprehensive that the introduction of German theology will, also, introduce German infidelity. With reference to some German works, this fear is but too just. But there are many valuable works, that appeared before the introduction of Rationalism into German theology, and in these are included all the Works of the Reformation, some of which are much needed in our day. And even while Rationalism and Pantheism flourished, some of the deepest and most spiritual works were written. There were always deeper natures, which could find peace only in the Gospel; and the prevailing infidelity impelled them to search deeper for the hidden things of God. For every crisis, God has his men; and in its darkest days, Germany

had some of the brightest lights, that have illumined this world. Then, we are passing through conflicts, similar to those waged in Germany. We must yet meet a foe who has already been vanquished there. History teaches us that Christianity passes through various conflicts, to the fulfillment of its mission. The nations in the van give weapons to those that follow them in the same warfare. In Germany, where the poison grew, the antidote is also found. And, as German scholars have already passed dangers that are yet before us, they have erected light-houses, where others were shipwrecked, and, if we will, we may be warned, and may escape the danger. German infidelity, and its modifications in this country, can best be met by the weapons that vanquished it in the land of its birth. But how can we remove an error, unless we master it? And how can we wield the proper weapons against it, unless we make them ours?

Many are suspicious of Symbolism in German theology. But this suspicion is by no means as valid as some, who labor in the interest of extreme symbolical tendencies, have tried to prove. The books quoted in that interest, represent only a part of German theology, just as the German Symbolists here represent but a part of the Lutheran Church of Germany. I do not hesitate to say, that many of the best scholars, and most spiritual theologians and preachers of Germany, agree in principle with the General Synod. The same principles that we advocate, are also advocated by men like Ehrenfeuchter of Göttingen, Beck of Tübingen, Tholuck and Müller of Halle, Nitzsch, Twesten and Dorner of Berlin, and many others, whose names and works are familiar to the American student. The Lutheran divines and professors, who coöperate with the Evangelical Alliance, are generally men of sterling piety and liberal Christian spirit. Whilst preparing this address, I received a religious journal published in Germany, which has a basis to which the General Synod can heartily subscribe. It contains the names of many eminent men in all parts of Germany, who assist the editor by their contributions, who agree with its spirit and principles, and who represent a very large part of the spiritual portion of the German Church. In its prospectus, is the following language: "The Holy Scripture is the foundation of faith, and the rule of life; Christianity and Christian culture are the pillars which support the temple

of genuine edification." With reference to its contents, it says: "Its contents are to consist of edifying articles with reference to the affairs of the Church, but without being confined to narrow-hearted confessional limitations,* though based on a positive Christian stand-point."

German theology is especially rich in Biblical science and literature, and much of its Scriptural depth has not yet been fathomed by us. There are many departments of thought, which the American student seldom enters, with which the German scholars are quite familiar. By them, subjects are thoroughly handled, which English and American students but seldom discuss. Their life of calmness, retirement, and profound and unceasing study, with the best aids and the greatest incentives, enables them to produce works, which our practical and distracted life could not produce. While there is not a department of theology, in which we might not learn from German theologians, there are some on which their works are specially valuable, such as dogmatics, history of dogmas, Christian, or Biblical Ethics, Biblical Psychology, Church History, Commentaries, and, in fact, all that belongs to Biblical science; and much of the matter on these subjects in the English language, is but a translation of the German. The replies to Strauss, Renan and Schenkel, are of special value in our conflicts with infidelity. And to learn how utterly unhistorical the arrogant claims of modern Symbolism are, one needs but read such works as Johannsen on the subject, or the various articles in Herzog's Encyclopedia on the subject, especially that on "Symbolische Bächer." There is much depth in German works, which might be used with advantage against the prevailing superficiality, and which might be made a spiritual leaven for our Church. And the deepest and most spiritual German theology being with us in principle, is as diametrically opposed to scepticism as to dead orthodoxy. And, it is by no means, merely speculative and metaphysical, as some imagine, but is the basis of all practical activity, giving the impulses that produced such men as Spener, Francke, Harms and George Müller.

I have discussed the principles which make the mission to our Publication Society peculiar, and have also referred of our intellectual resources; I cannot now call special attention to the greatness of the field it occupies, and the

* "*Ohne engherzige Einhaltung confessioneller Schranken.*"

importance of the mission it is called on to perform among the many thousands of Lutherans in this country. And every year by natural increase, and by emigration the field is enlarged, the demands are increased, the work of the Society is made more urgent, and our responsibilities are made greater. We are in a country, in which all is growth, and its growth is only in the germ; we have a Church in which all is life and progress, and we are only in the spring. Our past and our present create and encourage hope, and are prophetic of a rich future. Shall this Society be true to its principles? Shall its work be commensurate with its mission? Shall the buried talents in our Church be unearthed and put to usury, and shall the resources, that are ours, be used to enrich our Church? Can we not wed the depth and solidity of the spiritual theology of Germany to American enterprise and energy? Have we not the eye to see the greatness of our mission, the heart to feel its pressing urgency, the will and the means to accomplish it? In passing through this our crisis, shall we be true and conquer, or shall we be false and suffer defeat? The answer must come from the Church, from the whole Church. And in giving the answer, we must rise far above all prejudice, to the dignity of our principles, and the grandeur of our mission; there must be no Gettysburg, no Wittenberg, no Selinsgrove in the answer, but only the spirit of our Master. And there is but one thing to be feared in an arduous work; not our foes, not the greatness of our mission, not our weakness, not our God, but only our own faithlessness. If we are true to ourselves, God's omnipotence is ours, in the performance of our duty, and in the accomplishment of our mission.

God may have made it our privilege and duty, with such principles and such resources, to introduce a creative, formative and organizing leaven, into the present chaotic mass of religious thoughts. He may have given it to us, to give new impulses and new directions to the spiritual life of the age. Still we are in the day of small things; but let no man despise the day on that account. The cause that has in it God's truth and purpose is a seed, in which He already sees the results of the future, and which he blesses accordingly. And as the living seed is ever producing fruit, which again becomes fruit-bearing seed; and as the press multiplies one copy into thousands and

millions; so may this Lutheran Publication Society be a power that grows and multiplies with the demands of the Church and the Age!

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of Psalms. By Albert Barnes. Vols. II. III. The first volume of this *Commentary* was issued last year; these volumes conclude the venerable author's labors, as an interpreter of the Scriptures. They form an appropriate close to his valuable and highly useful work in this department, embracing a period of more than forty years. The early hours of the morning were devoted to the preparation of these Notes, and patiently and faithfully did the author labor on, till at the evening-time of his life, and at the end of his task, he gratefully lays down his pen. On every page you notice the results of his patient research, his calm judgment, great learning, evangelical spirit, and deep piety. Barnes' Commentaries will live, long after his departure from the earth, to enlighten the ignorant, and direct the inquiring, to aid future generations in the study of God's Word.

Foreign Missions: Their Relations and Claims. By Rufus Anderson, D. D., LL. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the author, is well qualified to discuss the subject. The work, consisting of fifteen lectures, is full of the most interesting matter, showing the extent of the field, the nature of the work, its progress and success, the hindrances at home and abroad, and the claims of missions upon the churches and upon young ministers of the Gospel. It is the most valuable manual on the various aspects of the missionary question, ever issued from the press.

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By Rev. W. J. Conybeare, and Rev. J. S. Howson. Two volumes in one, New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This work, one of the most valuable contributions to our Biblical literature, is so well known and so highly appreciated, that it seems superfluous to speak of its merits. The various editions, which are appearing, are a proof of its popularity and the favor with which it is regarded. The publishers tell us, that in the present volume the entire text and all the notes of the complete London edition together with the maps and illustrations are contained.

Sermons. By Charles Wadsworth, D. D., Minister of Calvary Church, San Francisco. New York and San Francisco: A. Roman & Co. The author of these discourses is well known as an attractive and eloquent preacher of the Gospel. The volume contains selections from his ordinary and miscellaneous preparations, all of a practical and deeply evangelical character, and presented in an interesting and instructive form, and with the author's characteristic earnestness and pathos.

Evening by Evening; or Readings at Eventide for the Family or the Closet. By C. H. Spurgeon. New York: Sheldon & Co. This volume is intended as an aid to religious meditation. The thoughts are generally pertinent, and often striking and impressive.

Christ in Song. Hymns of Immanuel: Selected from all Ages, with Notes. By Philip Schaff, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. This beautiful volume will be cordially welcomed by all who are interested in our hymnological literature. It is a magnificent work, an honor to the learned editor who has performed his part with so much skill and good taste, and a credit to the enterprising publisher who has presented it to the public in the best style of modern book-making. The collection which is as unique, as it is representative, embraces the choicest hymns on the Person and Work of our Lord, as the centre of our faith, from all ages, denominations and tongues, and is divided into two parts, the one, containing mainly those poems, that present the great objective facts in Christ's life (*Christus pro nobis*), the other, those that bring out more fully the subjective application of Christ's merits and our relation to Him (*Christus in nobis*). The critical and biographical notes accompanying the selections form an interesting feature in the work, and must prove of great value to the reader. We trust the volume will receive, as it so richly deserves, a wide circulation among Christians of every name. We find in the collection, "Happy Christmas comes once more," translated from the Danish, by Dr. C. P. Krauth, of Phil.

Care Cast upon the Lord. By Rev. J. Hall, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. This is a good little book, full of Christian comfort, designed especially for those, whose faith is feeble, and whose burdens are too heavy for them. The perusal of its kind exhortations, written in a simple and earnest style, cannot fail to make burdened hearts lighter and wearied lives brighter.

Outlines of Old Testament History for Youth. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. Mr. Shryock has again shown his good judgment in giving to the Church this admirable volume, so well adapted to the instruction of the young, recently prepared by the Rev. G. F. Maclear of England. We greatly rejoice in the good work which our Board is accomplishing, and trust that there is a still more prosperous career before it.

Plain Words. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store. This little volume contains Discourses on the "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," "The Glad Disciples," "The Burning Bush," and "The Lord's Supper," reprinted from the columns of the *Lutheran & Missionary*. Like all the productions of Dr. Seiss' pen, they indicate careful preparation, and are worthy of the high reputation which the author enjoys as a clear and vigorous writer, in this country and in England.

Incidents of the U. S. Christian Commission. By Rev. E. P. Smith, Secretary of the Field Commission. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippen-cott & Co. This volume contains facts and well-authenticated incidents, connected with the labors of the Christian Commission, selected from the reports of its delegates, and grouped together, as memorials of the War. The work is faithfully done, and no one can read the book without deep feeling, and with gratitude to God for the important service, rendered by this beneficent institution at a very critical period in the history of our country.

The Christian Sabbath Vindicated, and the Sabbath in its Political

Aspect. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The author of this volume is an intelligent layman, who has presented an interesting and attractive discussion of the subject, not in a didactic form, but designed more especially for the general reader.

A Doctrinal and Ritualistic View of the Holy Eucharist. By Hon. G. S. Lacy. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This discussion is by a member of the Louisiana Bar, and is written in the interest of the High Church party in the Episcopal communion, taking the highest ground on the question of the Real Presence.

Studies in Philosophy and Theology. By Joseph Haven, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Andover: W. F. Draper. These discussions will attract the attention of that growing class of readers, who are interested in questions of philosophical and theological science. The work is divided into two parts: I. Studies in Philosophy, including discussions on the Philosophy of Sir. William Hamilton, Mill *versus* Hamilton, The Moral Faculty, Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory, The Ideal and the Actual. II. Studies in Theology, embracing discussions on Natural Theology, The Doctrine of the Trinity, Theology as a Science, its Dignity and Value, Place and Value of Miracles in the Christian System, Sin, as related to Human Nature and the Divine Mind, Arianism—the Natural Development of the Views held by the early Church Fathers. These topics are ably presented, not in the interests of any particular religious denomination, or form of faith; but the simple results of a Christian scholar's independent investigation of truth.

An Alphabetical Index to the New Testament. Common Version. Suitable to any edition, and useful to all ministers, teachers and Bible readers. By S. Austin Allibone, LL. D. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. In Biblical literature a work, like the present, has long been a *disideratum*, and it is somewhat remarkable, that it has not, before this time, been supplied. But a portion of the needed work has now been accomplished in this valuable index to the New Testament, and we trust its industrious and learned author will not be discouraged from undertaking a similar work on the Old Testament. It is unnecessary to add, that whatever Dr. Allibone attempts is well done, and that the present labor is worthy of his well-earned reputation.

Recollections of a Busy Life. By Horace Greeley. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. This is an elegant octavo, well printed and beautifully illustrated, containing a history of the author's early life, his education, apprenticeship, adventures, professional and political reminiscences, Congressional and editorial experience. It is an exceedingly interesting and instructive work, furnishing not only the personal history of a remarkable man, but the history of our country during an important period.

Recollections of Men and Things at Washington, during the Third of a Century. By L. A. Gobright. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The author, during his long residence at Washington, in connection with the press as correspondent, reporter, or editor, had the most ample opportunities of observing men and things. The book begins with the exciting period connected with the United States Bank in 1834, and comes down to the present times. Many of the incidents and facts are here published for the first time.

Thunder and Lightning. By W. De Fonvielle. Translated from the French and edited by T. L. Phipson, Ph. D. F. C. S. Illustrated with thirty-nine engravings on Wood. *The Wonders of Optics.* By F. Marion. Translated from the French and edited by Charles W. Quinn. *The Phenomena and Laws of Heat.* By Prof. Achille Caizin. Translated and edited by Elishu Rich. Illustrated with seventy engravings on wood and a colored frontispiece. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. These are delightful volumes belonging to an extended series, designed to popularize science and art, which we are glad to see introduced into our country. The numerous illustrations, the pleasant style of the text and the large amount of instructive information here embodied, will render the series most acceptable to all classes of readers.

The English of Shakespeare: Illustrated in a Philological Commentary on his Julius Cæsar. By George L. Craik, Professor of History and of English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast. Edited from the third revised London edition, by W. J. Rolfe, Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. Boston: Edward Ginn. This beautiful and convenient edition of Craik's English of Shakespeare, contains interesting Prolegomena, the Tragedy of Julius Cæsar, and a valuable Philological Commentary, and is well adapted to awaken an interest, and to assist in the critical study of our vernacular. It may be used with advantage in our schools of a higher grade; and by all who desire a more philosophical acquaintance with our language and literature.

Introduction to the Study of English Literature. By Henry N. Day. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The author thinks that the English language and literature must be studied in their growth, and and by the thorough perusal of representative men, in the successive stages of growth. He, therefore, gives selections from distinguished writers, worthy of special study. These selections are accompanied with copious notes, philological, historical, and æsthetical, indicating and explaining the changes in the forms and meanings of the words, and the structure of the sentence, also, with a glossary, index and chronology of English Literature for systematic study.

A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon. Founded on the German-Latin Dictionaries of Dr. William Freund. With a brief comparison and illustration of the most important Latin Synonyms, compiled and abridged chiefly from the works of Dusnesnil, Ramshorn, Döderlein and Hill. Also, English-Latin Dictionary altered from the English-Latin Dictionary of Dr. Kaltschmidt. By P. Bullions, D. D. New York: Sheldon & Co. Of the great value of Dr. Bullions' labors in the direction of classical learning we have several times spoken in the *Review*. He was an experienced and successful teacher, and we take pleasure in commending to favor the volume before us.

The Conscript: A Story of the French War of 1813. By Erckmann—Chatrian. Translated from the French. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. This story, told with quaint simplicity and truthfulness, contains the experience of a young French peasant, a conscript in the Napoleonic wars, including the most touching incidents and thrilling sketches of the fearful battles in which he participated, particularly those of Lützen and Leipsic.

Waterloo: a Sequel to the Conscript of 1813. Translated from

the French of Erckmann—Chatrian. With six full-page illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The readers of the "Conscript" will receive with delight the continuation and conclusion of the charming story, and the desire will be increased for translations of similar works, written with so much skill.

Tales from Alsace, or Scenes and Portraits from Life in the days of the Reformation, as drawn from the Old Chronicles. Translated from the German. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The volume embraces a series of narratives, designed to illustrate the times of the Reformation. They are life-like and attractive, and carry the mind with interest to that thrilling period in the history of the Church.

Our Life in China. By Helen S. C. Nevius. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The writer of this volume with her husband, engaged in missionary labor, resided ten years in China, and, in an interesting and instructive narrative, here gives the result of her personal knowledge and experience.

Margaret Russell's School. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This is a beautiful story with useful lessons, and is worthy of a place among the excellent books for the young, bearing the impress of the Messrs. Carter.

Stella Ashton: or Conquered Faults. By C. Y. Barlow. Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues & Co. Mrs. Barlow is well known to many of our readers by her successful contributions to our Sunday School literature, and the publishers, by their seasonable publications, are placing the public under great obligations to them.

American Edition of Dr. Wm. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Hurd & Houghton. This admirable work so indispensable to every minister's library, revised and edited by Prof. Hackett, and Rev. Ezra Abbot, has reached the eighteenth number, which concludes with *Moses*.

Plymouth Pulpit has reached No. 10 of volume II. Each number contains a recently preached Sermon of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, and is the only authorized publication of his Sermons.

Addresses delivered at the Inauguration of Milton Valentine, D.D., as President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg Pa., December 21st, 1868. Gettysburg: "*Star and Sentinel*."

The Christian Sabbath. A Sermon delivered by J. A. Brown, D. D., Professor of Diadaetic Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in Christ Church, Gettysburg, February 21st, 1869. Published by the Theological Students. Gettysburg: "*Star and Sentinel*."

Luther's Translation of the Holy Scriptures: The New Testament. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania. Reprinted from the *Mercersburg Review* for April, 1869.

Messrs. Tipton & Myers, Photographers, of Gettysburg, have kindly placed on our table copies of their beautifully executed card Photographs of several of the Patriarchs of the Church, whose memory is so precious to us all. They are Drs. H. M. Muhlenberg, H. E. Muhlenberg, Helmuth, Schmidt, Goering and J. Geo. Schmucker. They are worthy of general circulation through the Church.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXIX.

Article.	Page
<p>I. SACRAMENTAL PRESENCE,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill.</p>	<p>317</p>
<p>II. THE KEYS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, Ohio.</p>	<p>341</p>
<p>III. THE WILL,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. ALLEN TRAVER, A. M., Andover, N. Y.</p>	<p>363</p>
<p>IV. REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN MINISTERS,.....</p>	<p>381</p>
<p>V. THE LORD'S SUPPER,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. B. GROSS, Easton, Pa.</p>	<p>401</p>
<p>VI. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. E. J. WOLF, A. M., Baltimore, Md.</p>	<p>418</p>
<p>VII. THE GERMAN COLONY AND LUTHERAN CHURCH IN MAINE,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. HENRY N. POHLMAN, D. D., Albany, N. Y.</p>	<p>440</p>
<p>VIII. THE SPECIAL MISSION OF THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, A. M., Pittsburgh, Pa.</p>	<p>462</p>
<p>IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....</p>	<p>474</p>

The *Review* is constantly improving. We unhesitatingly recommend it, and would like to see every Lutheran minister become a subscriber to it. We think that Prof. Stoever displays both ability and tact, and that he is favored in his contributions.—*Lutheran and Visitor, Columbia, S. C.*

The variety of topics discussed in this number, renders the table of contents attractive.—*Lutheran Standard, Columbus, O.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly* opens with an article on Death and the Intermediate State by Prof. Ehrehart, which is quite elaborate and able.—*The Evangelist, New York.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Prof. M. L. Stoever, of Pennsylvania College, is promptly out for April with these solid and valuable contents: (1) Death and the Intermediate State, Prof. C. J. Ehrehart; (2) True Faith—its Nature and Efficacy, Rev. N. Van Alstine; (3) The meaning of the word Selah (suggests that it may be (a) a suggestion when to rest the voice; (b) when some specially important thought needs pause for reflection; (c) may be an exclamation of praise, equivalent to our Hallelujah; (4) The Good Angels, Prof. H. L. Baugher; (5) How Shall we Order our Worship? J. A. Seiss, D. D.; (6) Lutheranism before Luther, Rev. R. Weiser; (7) The Keys, Rev. G. H. N. Peters; (8) Sermonizing, Prof. H. Ziegler, D. D.; (9) Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, Prof. V. L. Conrad; (10) Notices of New Publications. This *Quarterly* deserves a much wider circulation than it has ever achieved, and that outside of the Lutheran communion. It is excellently edited, and gives much matter of general interest to Christian scholars.—*The Congregationalist and Recorder, Boston.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* for April has been received. It deals chiefly with theological and ecclesiastical topics, and discusses them with dignity and vigor. It is the special organ of the branch in the Lutheran Church in this country, known as evangelical, and represents a good degree of learning and culture. The present issue discusses: Death and the Intermediate State; True Faith—its Nature and Efficacy; Meaning of the word Selah; The Good Angels; How shall we Order our Worship? Lutheranism before Luther; The Keys; Sermonizing; Sprague's Annals; Notices of New Publications. Gettysburg, Pa.—*The Morning Star, Dover, N. H.*

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXX.

OCTOBER, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. ARTICLE FOURTH OF THE
AUGSBURG CONFESSION.*

By MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

The Fourth Article of the Confession, now before us for discussion, brings us into the very heart of the great work of the Reformation. More than any other, it is the memorial Article of that sublime movement. It was for the Evangelical doctrine of Justification by Faith, as apprehended in the depths of Luther's experience, that the struggle was begun. When the conflict was ended, and the pure Gospel restored, this Article in the Confession of the regenerated and living Church, stood as the firm monumental column of the victory. It presents the central doctrine, about which the other articles took shape in clear harmony with each other, and in the living unity of the Gos-

* Fourth Lecture on the *Holman Foundation*, delivered June 28th, 1869, before the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa.

pel system. Not only for this truth, but in a peculiar manner *by* it, was the great work wrought. Set forth in its purity and power, it became the open channel through which the life-currents of Christ's grace came again into a reviving Church. No truth from the armory of the divine word became so distinctively "the sword of the Spirit" in the conflict. D'Aubigne's statement is apt and beautiful: "The powerful text, 'The just shall live by faith' was a creative word for the Reformer and the Reformation." We cannot overestimate the historical and theological importance of the Article before us. Had our noble Confessors been asked to name the special doctrine for whose recovery and restoration into the midst of the Christian system they were striving even unto blood, they would have pointed to this. Indeed, Melancthon did, in the very conflict, at Augsburg, thus single out and exalt this as "the principal and most important Article of the whole Christian doctrine."* Luther put it on the banner of the Reformation as the doctrine with which the Church must stand or fall. History has fully recognized this importance by not only characterizing it, as the "material principle of the Reformation," but as the distinguishing fundamental doctrine of Protestantism.

Like the doctrine of the atonement, in close relation to which the truth of this Article stands, the doctrine of justification is one of pure revelation, and in its examination our appeal must necessarily be to the word of God. The suggestions of reason, and the dogmas of ecclesiastical authority must all be held subject to its divine decisions. Thus we retain as inseparably joined with this "material principle of the Reformation," the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures, recognized with equal historic clearness as its grand "formal principle."

The general analysis of the Article is easy. It has been so framed as to present the whole doctrine of justification under its negative and positive aspects, the former as renouncing the errors which had obtained destructive sway in the Romish Church, and the latter as declaring the true doctrine of the blessed Gospel. We shall probably best accomplish our object, to set forth at once the teachings of our Church and the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, on this subject, by treating it under these two aspects, and

* Apol. Art. IV, (II).

noting the historical and theological relations thus involved. The specific points in the confessional statement will thus be indicated, and covered in the discussion.

I. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF SELF-JUSTIFICATION.

The language of the Article is clear and emphatic: *Our Churches teach that we cannot obtain forgiveness of sin and be justified before God, by our own strength, merits, or works.*" This, as the exhibition of the subject on its negative side, sets forth a truth that is fundamental in Christian doctrine. The Confessors could not have maintained the integrity of the Gospel system of grace, without this denial of a self-wrought righteousness.

1. The pressing necessity for it, at the time, was to witness against the false teaching of Rome. Her corruption of the doctrine of Justification had been the point of the introduction of almost all the deadly errors that were holding sway over souls. Perversion of the truth here became an inevitable perversion of many of the most vital and practical forces of Christianity. It was, like an obscuration of the sun, the shrouding of everything in darkness. The heavy shadows of mediaeval history, and the deep paralysis of the whole Church, bear painful testimony to the wide-spread consequences. The words of Luther on Gen. XXI, were verified in the sad experience: "This is the chief article of faith, and if it is taken away or corrupted, the Church cannot stand, nor can God retain his glory, which is that he may exercise mercy, and for the sake of his Son, forgive and save." The manifold cry that was going up to heaven for a reformation of the Church, arose from the hiding of the way of salvation in a perversion of this prime and vital doctrine. No correction of external abuses alone could heal her hurt, and restore her health and power. The remedial process must touch the deep point, whence all the disorders went forth. The error had hidden "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," from the view of perishing men. The false teaching of Rome was two-fold :

First, instead of exhibiting justification in its true nature as an external, forensic act of God, she represented it as subjective and internal. The error was one of long growth. Its rise may be traced back through a development of centuries. The germ of it was involved in the statement of Augustine: "*Justificat impium Deus, non sol-*

um dimittendo, quae mala facit, sed etiam donando caritatem, quae declinat a malo et facit bonum per Spiritum Sanctum."*

The name and authority of Augustine, like a royal stamp on coin, gave currency to this representation. From his day the idea was developed, confounding justification with sanctification, and making it, not an objective divine act, but something subjective and transitive, constituting men internally and essentially righteous. It was regarded as a *making righteous*, by the communication of the Divine life in fellowship with Christ. Perhaps, in its earlier announcement, this view was meant to guard against the tendency to rely on a merely nominal faith, and to hold saving faith in its undivorced connection with the new life of grace. Without a divine vitality in union with faith, Christianity would lose its transforming and up-lifting power. But unfortunately, instead of showing the necessary relation of regeneration and sanctification to the faith in which God's justification of the sinner is conditioned, it introduced a confusion of thought and expression, in which the objective Divine act, and the subjective attending change, were confounded and identified. Most of the prominent Schoolmen made justification consist in the subjective character of the believer, as constituted intrinsically holy in the effectual operation of faith. The product of grace in the soul was made its basis and condition. By Thomas Aquinas it was represented as involving an infusion of the divine life, *infusio gratiae*. "*Justificatio primo ac proprie dicitur factio justitiae, secundario vero et quasi improprie potest dici justificatio significatio justitiae, vel dispositio ad justitiam. Sed si loquamur de justificatione proprie dicta, justitia potest accipi prout est in habitu, vel prout est in actu. Et secundum hoc justificatio dupliciter dicitur, uno quidem modo, secundum quod homo fit justus adipiscens habitum justitiae, alio vero modo, secundum quod opera justitiae operatur, ut secundum hoc justificatio nihil aliud sit quam justitiae executio. Justitia autem, sicut et aliae virtutes, potest accipi et acquisita, et infusa. * * Acquisita quidem causatur ex operibus, sed infusa causatur ab ipso Deo per ejus gratiam.*"* This *infusio gratiae* was necessary to the forgiveness of sin by God. Though some, by deeper experiences of grace, clearer recognition of the witness of their Christian consciousness,

* Opus Cont. Jul. II. Ch. 168.

* Summ. P. II. 1. Quoted by Hagenbach.

and better insight into Scripture teaching, were led to more objective views, *their* truer sentiments were so feebly sustained as to make no impression on the settled opinion. So that the decision of the Council of Trent may be regarded as setting forth the doctrine of the times on this point: "Justification is not remission of sins merely, but also sanctification and the renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and divine gifts, so that he who was unrighteous is made righteous, and the enemy becomes a friend, and an heir according to the hope of eternal life."* According to this, Justification becomes the renewal and transformation of the believer's nature. It is a transitive process making him really and internally righteous. The vigorous vindication of this doctrine by Bellarmin, *De Justif.*, demonstrates the strength with which the error had laid hold of the mind of the age.

This view involves, as necessary sequence, the existence of *degrees* of Justification, according to the extent of the Divine operation within the believer. Made to consist in a subjective holiness, of varied development but always imperfect, no certain assurance of forgiveness, and acceptance with God could be enjoyed. For the evidence of his justification, the Christian had to look within himself, and measure it in the degree, in which he had been made really righteous. He had to base his assurance of hope, not on the objective perfect righteousness and work of Christ, but on a righteousness wrought in partial measure by the Divine operation in his heart. What might be the minimum of infused righteousness necessary for Justification, could not be known. No one could settle the point of a sure grade of self-worthiness for acceptance before an infinitely holy God. Hence it was taught that no one could, without a particular revelation, be assured of his salvation. No wonder that Luther could find no peace for his stricken soul, till a truer view of Justification shed the Divine light on his mind. No wonder that the Reformers so emphatically declare that the doctrine of Rome could give no relief and comfort to the sin-burdened conscience.† As

* "*Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntarium susceptionem gratiae et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus ex inimico amicus, ut sit haeres secundum spem vitae aeternae.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. Cap. 7.

† Apol. Art. IV. (II).

long as men are directed to look only on the righteousness that is personal, and inherent in them, at the very best defective, and coupled with vile and condemning sin, it is impossible to find a reliable consolation and rest. The unhappy error stands in the boldest, and most self-rebuking contrast with the declaration of St. Paul, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5 : 1.

The second element in the false teaching of Rome was the inclusion of good works in the ground of justification. Those were represented and looked upon as meritorious, and, at least, in part, influential in securing the sinner's acceptance. It is but just, however, to say that Rome did not mean to be understood as wholly and absolutely excluding the work of Christ from the foundation of the sinner's justification. In a certain sense there was a recognition of indebtedness to his redeeming grace for it. But the conception of Christ's relation to it was so confused and overloaded with qualifying explanations as to present, practically and really, a doctrine of justification by human works and merit. A certain ability to perform acceptable works without grace was claimed for man. And though grace was regarded as influential in engrafting the sinner's nature into the sources of the divine life, both in the earlier and later stages of the work there was an inclusion of the idea of worthiness and merit. The very products of grace, in the progressive justification which was based on intrinsic and growing holiness, were viewed as deserving, and justly securing the favor of God. The human good work was represented as acting in *conjunction* with the merit of Christ, in attaining justification before God. Melancthon's declaration in the Apology expresses the result : "When the scholastics attempt to define how man is justified before God, they teach only the righteousness and piety of a correct external deportment before the world, and of good works, and in addition devise the dream that human reason is able, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things." "In this manner our adversaries have taught that men *merit* the remission of sins."* The subtle distinction between *meritum de congruo*, and *meritum de condigno*, originated by Thomas Aquinas, and employed by Romish theologians

* Apol. Art. IV. (II).

in explanation of their doctrine, does not save its character. For although Christ alone was represented as having originally and in Himself a *meritum condigni*, yet a *meritum congrui* was claimed as attainable by the sinner prior to grace, and then the *meritum condigni* was connected with all his good works. Before his conversion, and independently of the *primam gratiam* or *habitus*, of which they sometimes spoke as gained for him by Christ, he could perform good works which formed this merit of congruity rendering it meet, proper, equitable and necessary for God to reward with grace. The Apology presents the idea clearly: "They maintain that the Lord God must of necessity give grace unto those who do such good works; not, indeed, that he is compelled, but because this is the order, which God will not transgress or alter." Through this kind of merit he was supposed to attain the *habitus* or quickened disposition and inclination to love God. Then by love, patience, zeal, and good works, he attained the merit of congruity which could claim a recompence and eternal life on the score of desert and justice. "The Papists," writes *Luther*, on Gal. 2 : 16, "say, that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of congruity (which they call *meritum de congruo*,) because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is obtained, the work following deserveth everlasting life of due debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*." Besides this, it must be remembered, that they taught that Christ made satisfaction in his obedience and death only for original sin, leaving actual sins to be covered by the believer's penances and good works, denying at the same time, that the Redeemer by His work and sufferings has secured any such righteousness as may be imputed to the sinner and justify him in the sight of God.* The Gospel of grace was thus thoroughly overthrown in a more than semi-Pelagian scheme of Justification by human strength and good works. The merit of Christ was displaced from its sacred position as the only and sufficient ground of the sinner's acceptance, and the way of grace was no more grace.

The following admirable summary of these aspects of the false teachings of Rome, is drawn from a Treatise, "*De Justitia Inhaerente, contra Pontificios*," by John Peter Ko-

* See Gerhard *Loci*, Vol. VII. Cap. II.

now, Wittenberg, 1687.* "In the first place the Papists teach that an adult, while yet unrenewed, can, by the natural powers of his free will, with the aid of inciting and assisting grace, perform some spiritually good works. Not only is he able, but if he desires to be justified, he is obliged to perform acts of faith, fear, hope, love, penitence, reception of the provided sacraments, of new life and obedience to the commands of God. Just as in natural changes, certain dispositions must precede, by which the subject is prepared to receive the new form, so in Justification, man who is to undergo a spiritual change, must dispose and prepare himself for the attainment of righteousness."

* Principio igitur supponunt Pontificii, hominem adultum, nondum renatum, ex naturalibus liberi arbitrii veribus, auxiliante gratia excitati, moti, adjutique, actus quosdam edere posse, spiritualiter bonos. Nec solum posse sed etiam, si justificari cupiat, debere edere actum fidei, timoris, spei, dilectionis, pœnitentiæ, propositi suscipiendi sacramenta, et novae vitae, atque observationis mandatorium Dei. Quæmadmodum enim in omnibus mutationibus, necesse est, quasdam præcedere dispositiones, quibus subjectum præparetur ad recipiendam formam : ita hominem, in justificatione, modo quodam spirituali mutandum, actibus memoratis, se ipsum oportere disponere, ac præparare, ad consequendam justitiam.

Ac fide quidem, ex auditu concepta, liberé moveri in Deum, credendo vera esse, quæ ab ipso revelata, atque promissa sunt ; præsertim justificari impium illius gratia, per redemptionem, quæ est in Christo Jesu. Ipsamque fidem hanc, esse initium justificationes, et primam quasi radicem, quæ fores quodammodo timori, spei, caritati, caeterisque dispositionibus aperiât, æque necessariis, sola minimé sufficiat. * * * Porro quamlibet prædictarum dispositionum, ideoque et fidem, primam illam in ordine, non solum se tenere ex parte materiae, vel subjecti dispositi, verum, etiam ex parte agentis : non in genere organicæ, apprehendentis meritum Christi, sed meritoriae proprio actu Justificationem impetrantis, et promerentis. Non equidem de condigno, ex justitia, intrinsecaque bonetate ; sed ex acceptatione Dei, et congruentia quadem, ac honestate.

Jam ex quo homo ad eum modum sese disposuit, præparavitque, Deum, remisso, hoc est, ut illi explicant, expulso peccato, ei dicunt infundere justitiæ habitum, quo formaliter justu reddatur, est ad vitam æternam acceptetur. Non unum, ac simplicem, sed fidei, spei, caritatis, patientiæ, similesque plures habitus complectem. * * * Etenim Justificatio Pontificiis in Primam Secundamque dividitur.

They represent also that, through faith, which comes by hearing, man is freely moved toward God, by believing those things which have been revealed and promised by Him, especially that the sinner is justified through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. This faith is itself the beginning, and, as it were, the first root of justification, which in a manner opens the way for fear, hope, love, and other equally needful dispositions: this alone, is by no means sufficient. * * * They teach further, that these dispositions, among which faith is the first in order, are not merely results wrought in a passive subject, but belong to his active agency; not in the way of an instrumental cause, apprehending the merits of Christ, but as a meritorious cause, by its own proper act obtaining and deserving justification; not, indeed, *de condigno*, on the ground of justice and intrinsic goodness, but as acceptable to God, and fitting and honorable.

Now, after man has prepared himself in this way, they say that with the remission, that is, as they explain, the expulsion of sin, God infuses into him a principle, (*habitus*) of righteousness, by which he is formally rendered righteous and accepted for eternal life. This *habitus* is not single and simple, but embraces principles, (*habitus*) of faith, hope, charity and repentance. * * * *

For Justification is distinguished by the Papists into *first* and *second*. They call that the first, in which sinful man becomes righteous, through infused principles of faith, hope, love, patience, &c. They make that the *second*, by which the righteous man is made more righteous through works of righteousness, performed from the infused princi-

Primam vocant, qua homo ex impio fit justus, per infusos habitus, fidei, caritatis, patientiae, &c. Secundam appellant, qua homo justus, efficitur justior per opera justitiae ex infusis habitibus praestita habitualement justitiam conservantia, alentia, augentia, ac perficientia. Quare ad Primam illam opinantur sufficere habitum fidei, conjunctum cum caeteris infusae justitiae habitibus. Atque ita justificari primo infantes regenitos, propria fide actuali carentes. Tum quoque adultos, qui post conversionem sui non supervivunt. Quanquam sub hac diversitate, ut infantes doceant justificari per solum habitum fidei, spei et caritatis, absque omni prava dispositione adultos autem per habitus eosdem, praeexistentibus dispositionibus ex gratia praeveniente. Utrosque sine operibus justitiae, ex infuso habitu praestitis: adultos non ab-

ples or inclinations, maintaining, nourishing, increasing and perfecting an habitual righteousness. For this *first* Justification they suppose the principle of faith, joined with the other infused principles of righteousness, sufficient. And so primarily regenerate infants, are justified, without any actual faith of their own. Thus, also, adults who do not continue to live after their conversion. With this difference, however, that infants are justified through the principle of faith, hope and love alone, without any previous disposition, but adults through these same principles, preceded by dispositions from prevenient grace. Both are justified without the works of righteousness, performed from the infused principle—adults not without preparatory acts which are also numbered among good works. In the *second* Justification, of adults who live after conversion and the remission of their sins, works of righteousness proceeding from the infused principles are also required; and these are properly meritorious, deserving not only an increase of habitual righteousness, but also, life and eternal salvation. * * * * But to state the whole doctrine in a few words, the Papists agree in representing the justification of man in the sight of God as threefold. *First*, inchoative, in inceptive dispositions in which a formal righteousness is begun: *Secondly*, Formally through an infused principle [*habitus*] of righteousness: *Thirdly*, meritoriously, through the exercise of the infused principle, or the works which follow that principle. All this righteousness of man thus justified in the way of inceptive dispositions, formally, and meritoriously, they call *inherent*; whether it exist as a quality, or an activity, and thus

sque actibus praeparatoriis, quos ipsos etiam in bonis operibus numerant. In secunda verò Justificatione, hominum adultorum, qui post sui conversionem, et obtentam remissionem peccatorum, tamdiu supervivunt, donec occasio implendae legis occurrat, et fidei, et caeterorum habituum infusorum exercita, vel opera justitiae exinfusis habitibus profecta requirunt: eadem quae proprie meritoria, non tantum incrementi justitiae habitualis, sed etiam ipsius vitae, salutisque aeternae. *

* * * Ut rem in pauca contraham, censeo Pontificii. hominem coram Deo justificari trifariam. Primum dispositivè, seu inchoativè, per dispositiones, quibus inchoetur formalis justitia. Secundò formaliter, per infusum justitiae habitum. Tertio meritoriè, per exercitia infusi habitus, seu opera, habitum illum consequentia, Omnemque illam justitiam hominis, dispositivè, formaliter, et meri-

subsisting in the man, just as an attribute belongs to the subject in which it inheres. On account of this diversity they also distinguish inherent righteousness as Habitual and Actual. Habitual righteousness they treat as a permanent rectitude, in the way of habits [*habitus*] or an infused principle out of which the rectitude of all the powers proceed, involving such spiritual affections in the believer that, whenever he will, he may with readiness, ease and delight, perform good works. To the Actual righteousness they refer, *first*, the person's dispositions of faith, fear, hope, and other acts in which they desire the Habitual righteousness to be begun. Then also, principally and specifically, they place Actual righteousness in the exercise of the Habitual righteousness, and declare it to be nothing else than the endeavor after good works by which the Christian maintains his justification, and by truly deserving it, secures for himself both an increase of righteousness, and eternal life and salvation." Cap. IV—X.

From this sad confounding of justification with sanctification in the doctrine of justification by an inherent righteousness, and the consequent belief in the meritoriousness of works, the way was open to the greatest absurdities and abuses. The deep poison of the error flowed out, in blighting power, through all the currents of the Church's life. It could not but be that practical piety, cut off from its sources of true vitality, should be perverted into multitudinous false and unseemly manifestations. The merit of work and ascetic self-culture became the very soul of the monastic seclusions, pilgrimages, penances, and the circle

torie justificati, Inhaerentem nominant : utpote vel per modum qualitatis habitam, vel actu exercitam, ideoque homini inexistentem, sicut accidens est in subjecto, cui inhaeret. Pro qua etiam varietate Inhaerentem justitiam in Habitualement et Actualement dispescunt. Ac Habitualement quidem ajunt, esse rectitudinem per manentem ad modum habitus vel habitum infusum, ex quo omnium potentialium rectitudo proveniat : Homine ita affecto, ut quando velit, prompté, facile, et cum delectatione operari possit. Ad Actualement autem justitiam referunt primo dispositiones suas, fidei, timoris, spei, cacterosque actus, quibus inchoari volunt justitiam habitualement. Tum atque praecipué, specificéque Actualement justitiam in exercitio Habitualis justitiae collocant, et nihil aliud esse tradunt, quam studium bonorum operum, quibus homo justificationem continuans, proprie merendo sibi et accessionem justitiae, et vitam salutemque aeternam acquirat.

of perverted and perverting will-worship, which at once deformed the christian life and disgraced the church of that day. From the doctrine of personal justification by works, the step was easy to the conclusion that special zeal and devotion might do more than enough to justify. Here was the natural entrance of the doctrine of supererogatory works. These were regarded as forming a treasury of accumulated merit, at the disposal of the Church. Though at first the merits of Christ were held mainly to constitute the Church's treasure,* the doctrine was developed so as to refer almost exclusively to the superabounding merits of the saints.† Out of this false doctrine arose the monstrous system of indulgences, into which the gross darkness of mediæval christianity culminated. The confounding of Justification with regeneration and sanctification, and looking upon it as inherent, thus proved the direful source of nearly all the Church's woes. It presented in vivid reality the truth of Luther's words, "*Jacente articulo justificationis omnia jacent.*" Against an error so dishonoring to Christ and fruitful of evils, the Confessors felt called upon to bear emphatic and solemn testimony. Fidelity to the Redeemer, to His truth, and to imperiled and perishing souls, could not otherwise be maintained.

2. In this witnessing against Rome, they were taking a position sustained and demanded by the Holy Scriptures. Their renunciation of the Papal error was simply a clear statement of the emphatic teaching of the word of God. Recurrence to a few passages will suffice to show the harmony of the Confession with the Scriptures, and the solemn urgency, with which they guard against the idea of justification by our "own merit, strength, or works."

"The man that doeth them shall live by them," Gal. 3 : 12, is given as the rule of the "law of commandments." Perfect obedience is made the legal condition of acceptance before God. That this is impossible with man, is asserted in the harmonious voice of all the Scriptures. St.

* Alexander Halesius, *Summa* P. IV, qu. Art. 2. *Indulgentiae et relaxationes fiunt de meritis supererogationis membrorum Christi, et maxime de supererogationibus meritorum Christi, quae sunt spiritualis thesaurus Ecclesiae.*

† Albertus Magnus, *Sent.* Lib. IV. Dist. 20. Art. 16. *Indulgentia sive relaxatio est remissio poenae inunctae ex vi clavium et thesauro supererogationis perfectorum procedens.*

Paul, Rom. 3 : 9—10, declares, "We have proved both Jews and Gentiles under sin. * * There is none righteous, no, not one." "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law ; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," vs. 19, 23. From this condition of sin and condemnation, in which every man is by nature, there is declared to be no escape by his own strength, obedience, or works. "The law worketh wrath," Rom. 4 : 15. "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight," Rom. 3 : 20. "That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident : for the just shall live by faith," Gal. 3 : 11. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness had been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin," Gal. 3 : 21, 22. All that the law can do with sinners is to condemn, and occasion the knowledge of sin. In the way of bringing men to salvation, this is declared to be its distinct and only office. No guilty soul can struggle back into the favor of God, by observance of its requisitions. It is "a schoolmaster" (*παιδαγωγός*, not an instructor, but a servant whose office it was to conduct children to and from the public schools,) to lead to *Christ*, as the only provided righteousness. In these and many other passages, reiterating this truth in multiplied forms and with earnest emphasis, the Reformers saw an absolute exclusion of the hope of salvation by human strength, or works. The sinner is left helpless and hopeless in himself. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," Gal. 5 : 10.

Not only in the general denial of justification by works, but in the particular repudiation of the idea of *merit*, were the Reformers but reasserting a fundamental truth of God's word. The whole notion of merit, in which the false theory of justification had been based by Rome, is opposed by the clear teaching of Scripture. The principle is laid down by our Saviour, "When ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants : we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke 17 : 20. The best fulfilment of the law, and the purest attainments of holiness do not go beyond duty, and are not regarded by God as earning any claim before him. Hence the unequivocal statement

which totally excludes the notion of merit, "Ye are saved by grace—not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. 2 : 8, 9. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works : otherwise, grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace : otherwise, work is no more work." Rom. 11 : 6. Even the smallest share of merit is thus excluded from the observance of the law and the services of piety. Neither as supplementary to the work of Christ, nor in any combination with it, do the Scriptures tolerate a notion of human merit, in the foundation of the sinner's justification.

3. This teaching of the Divine word is fully sustained by the decisions of enlightened reason. In this, the truth is fortified with additional strength. It is true, that Reason is not to sit as a judge of the doctrines of revelation. Its concurring conclusions, however, aid in fixing our conviction of these doctrines. The truths of the word stand out in clearer demonstration and power, when they at once make answer for themselves to every man's intellect and conscience. This truth is of this kind. Our Confessors in throwing it into the bold foreground of their view of justification, were taking a position in which they could hear every voice from Scripture answered by consenting and confirmatory voices from the conscience and reason of mankind. The painful helplessness of our guilty race has ever been crying out, "Wherewith shall a man come before God, or bow himself before the Almighty?" Reason adjudges, that an unfallen and sinless being may be accepted before God on the principle, "He that doeth them shall live by them." An unbroken and perfect obedience by a holy being leaves no place for condemnation. But he that offends in a single point becomes a transgressor. And "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not." We must thus view our race, as it really is, under condemnation for original and actual sin. The question as it must come up before our reason, concerns the justification of *sinners*, and the conclusion flows in rigid logical sequence from the premises. Sin, in its very nature, is a withholding from God what is His due. It involves opposition of the creature's will to Him, and refusal of the obedience and service which belong to Him. This withholding what is due to God becomes both a crime and a debt. Thus, not only the obedience withheld, but satisfaction for the crime, must be required of the sinner. He has not only fallen

into fatal arrears, but come under the penalty of a law and government on whose sacred inviolability the peace and order of a moral universe are hung. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," as the eternal law of God's holiness and love, announces the destruction into which the transgressor has brought himself. With his fallen nature, he is now able neither to keep the law nor to render satisfaction for its past violation. He cannot pay the debt. In his criminal inability, every effort to obey is defective, and vitiated by sin. Could he even start anew, and render thenceforth a perfect obedience, the past would remain without satisfaction. All a man's powers, his time, his talents, his skill and service, belong to God. There is not a moment in which he can feel released from the claims of God upon him, not a power of body, a faculty of mind, an endowment of energy, which is beyond the obligation of entire consecration to Him. And were he, as a creature, enabled thenceforth to give to God a perfect service, he would only be doing his present duty, and could have no surplus of time or powers to atone for the past and pay the dreadful debt. Thus, on both points, man must come fatally short. His works can no longer justify him. This part of our Article is, therefore, sustained by the clearest deductions of reason, as well as by the emphatic teachings of the word of God.

The deep and deadly error of Rome has thus been renounced. Faithful and true witness is borne against it. That doctrine maintaining the meritoriousness of good works, and teaching men to rely upon them for justification before God, was falsifying the Gospel, and laying another foundation, than that which is laid in Jesus Christ. "Thus these men conceal Christ from us," exclaims Melancthon, "and bury him anew, so that it is impossible for us to recognize him as a Mediator."* It was the all-perverting error, in which centered the crying necessity of the Reformation.

II. THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

A more concise, comprehensive and vigorous statement of the positive side of this great doctrine could scarcely be framed: "We obtain forgiveness of sins, and are justified before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, if

* Apol. Art. IV.

we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that our sins are remitted unto us for Christ's sake, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him, Rom. III and IV." This presents all the principal truths in the teaching of the Gospel on the subject. It calls our attention to the four great and all-inclusive points: I. *The Source of Justification*, "Grace," [*aus gnaden, gratis*;] 2. *The Ground of it*, "For Christ's sake," "Christ suffered for us"—"made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death;" 3. *The Nature of it*, "We obtain forgiveness of sins, righteousness and eternal life;" 4. *The instrument*, "Through Faith." An intelligent view of the teaching of our Confession will be obtained by looking at these points in their order.

I. *The Source.*

This is the grace of God, which, in the technical language of Theology is denominated the efficient cause, *causa efficiens*, of justification. "God forgives us our sins out of pure grace."* "Justified freely by his grace," says St. Paul, Rom. 3 : 24. "God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life," John 3 : 16. It is needless to repeat the numerous texts which trace up our salvation to its source in the compassionate love and grace of God. They are varied and multiplied in rich profusion throughout the New Testament. Even faith though most vitally involved in our justification, is in no sense its source or efficient cause. "It is God that justifieth," Rom. 8 : 33, His own love having made the provision by which he can be just and yet thus justify the ungodly. Rom. 3 : 25; 4 : 5. The sense of the term grace, Heb. ¹⁷, Greek *charis*, as used in this connection, must be clearly distinguished. It expresses neither any divine act done for us, nor any quality or excellence wrought in us, but the mercy and benevolence of God toward us.† And this

* Form of Concord, Art. III.

† Melancthon, Loci Theo. De Gratia : Facessant Aristotelica figmenta de qualitatibus. Non aliud enim est gratia si exactissime describenda sit, nisi Dei benevolentia erga nos, seu voluntas Dei miserta nostri. Non significat ergo gratiae vocabulum qualitatem aliquam in nobis; sed potius ipsam Dei voluntatem seu benevolentiam Dei erga nos.

grace from which justification and salvation freely flow, must be referred to the one God, revealed as the Trinity in unity. "I, even, I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Saviour," Is. 43 : 11. Whilst maintaining the order and distinction of the Persons in the Trinity, the Scriptures clearly refer to the whole Godhead, in pointing us to the primal source of the sinner's forgiveness and salvation. Hence our Justification is interchangeably ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. John 3 : 16; Gal. 2 : 20; Rom. 5 : 5; Col. 3 : 13; Is. 53 : 11; 1 Cor. 6 : 11. The connection of this fact, with the use of the names of the three Persons of the Trinity in the formula of Baptism, is obvious and suggestive.

2. The Ground of Justification.

This, known as the meritorious cause, *causa meritoria*, is the whole work of Jesus Christ, by which he has attoned for human sins, and brought in a complete and everlasting righteousness: "Justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3 : 24, 25. In this aggregate work of Christ, in which is laid the deep and secure foundation of our acceptance and salvation, there are three things to be considered :

1. It must be viewed as the work of the *Godman*. Both before and after the Reformation the question was agitated whether Christ is our righteousness, according to his Divine, or his human nature.* The question was one which touched upon a deep and vital point of Christian doctrine, and the correct view becomes of great importance. The view that held to our justification by Christ's righteousness according to his Divine nature alone, confounded the true, essential, unchangeable righteousness of the Son of God, in his true, natural and essential divinity with that vicarious work which forms the meritorious righteousness pro-

* Peter Lombardus, III Sent. Dist. 19. Christus mediator est in quantum homo, nam in quantum Deus non Mediator, sed aequalis est Patri.

Busaeus, Disp. de Persona Christi : Christus est mediator tantum secundum humanam naturam. Quoted from Gerh. Loci Theol. Loc. XVII, Cap. 2. See Osiandrian Controversy, in Ch. Hist.

vided in his obedience and death, and imputed to the sinner; whilst the view which held that Christ is our righteousness according to his human nature alone failed to include what is indispensable to the efficacy, value and perfection of his redeeming work. We can be justified only by Christ, as our righteousness, according to both natures.

It is necessary carefully to distinguish between the essential and immutable holiness of the Son of God, in his Divine nature, and that righteousness which He came and wrought out for our fallen race. The essential holiness of that nature must indeed be recognized as a necessary condition of his work for us, but it is different from it. Neither his human nature nor his Divine nature intrinsically, is the basis of our justification, but the work done, the life lived, the obedience maintained, the sufferings endured, for us, in the one Person of the Godman. The point is, that in looking for the ground of our justification, we are not to regard the intrinsic *character* of the Deity of Christ as imputed to us, but the "obedience unto death," which He in his sinless theanthropic person has provided as the basis of our pardon and acceptance. It is what he has done and furnished in the economy and work of redemption. Because of his sinless Divine holiness, He *could* become our righteousness, but he has actually become such *by* all that, in the unity of his Divine-human person, He has done to supply what we had *not* done, and to release us from the consequences of our sins. This *work* of the Son of God for us must be viewed as including his incarnation—the very act of his becoming Godman, in which He also becomes "our Righteousness." In other words, He became "*our* righteousness only in his becoming the Godman and the work then wrought, in the union of both natures, for us. In the Divine nature alone He could not have suffered and died, and without the communion of the Divine with the human in the unity of one person, the sufferings and obedience of Christ would have lacked the infinite merit, necessary to their atoning efficacy. Hence the Form of Concord states, with admirable clearness: "Christ is our righteousness, neither according to the Divine nature alone, nor yet according to the human nature alone, but the *whole Christ*, according to both natures, in or through that obedience alone which He, as God and man, rendered to the Father even unto death, and by which He has merited for us forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Epit. III. 1.

"In this manner neither the Divine, nor the human, nature of Christ by itself is imputed to us for righteousness, but the obedience of the Person alone, who is at the same time God and man." "Thus, too, the disputed point concerning the indwelling of the essential righteousness of God* in us, must be rightly explained. For though God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is the eternal and essential righteousness, dwells, through faith, in the elect, who are justified through Christ, and reconciled to God, (for all Christians are temples of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,) yet this indwelling of God is not that righteousness of faith, concerning which St. Paul speaks, and which he calls *justitia Dei*, that is, the righteousness of God, on account of which we are justified before God."†

2. It embraces Christ's *active obedience* for us. The whole of Christ's earthly work must be regarded as vicarious. To act in our stead, He was "made under the law." His incarnation, in which is seen the incipient act in his becoming "*our* righteousness," was preparatory not only to suffering for our sins, but to fulfilment of the law for us. An atonement, made by sacrificial death, releasing from an incurred penalty, is in itself not the full bringing in of a perfect righteousness by the imputation of which we will have all that we need. More than the negative condition of being simply pardoned, is necessary. We need to be looked upon, as if we were positively righteous. The obedience of Christ, in which the law was kept and honored, was an essential element in furnishing for us what the Law and holiness of God demanded of us. Where we were sinners, He, acting mediatorially in a vicarious life, was perfectly righteous. This sinless active obedience of the Godman, must be viewed not simply as a needful condition to an efficaciously atoning death, but as

* This was the precise form of the error of Osiander, whose controversies distracted the Church for some years, prior to the Form of Concord. Misapplying some of Luther's expressions concerning the indwelling of Christ in the soul, through faith, he represented Christ as the righteousness of the believer by being *in* him. "Through the Word dwelling in us, we are justified." "The Gospel has two parts; the first, that Christ has satisfied the justice of God; the second, that he purifies and justifies us from sin, by dwelling in us." Quoted from Wieseler, Ch. Hist. IV. pp. 470—471.

† Form Con. Decl. III.

being in itself an essential part of that righteousness which is imputed to us. Before men could inherit the blessings promised to obedience, the Divine Substitute had to fulfil for them all its holy precepts. *Buddæus* has presented the truth clearly: "Christ did not only expiate our sins by his sufferings and death, but through his whole life most completely fulfilled the law in our stead. He thus made satisfaction for us, not only by a most precious sacrifice to offended Deity, but also by performing everything which the Divine justice, so infinitely offended by the sins of men, could demand. Thus all obligation to punishment ceased and was taken away, and God, being thus reconciled, is prepared to forgive all our sins, and to receive us into the number of his children, when we embrace the merits of Christ in true faith."*

The inclusion of Christ's active obedience in the ground of justification is a point of great importance. From the earliest ages of the Christian Church much stress was laid on this part of his work. Though his death has always been recognized as the crown of his saving love, his work was represented as carried on through all the stages of his life. This truth is involved in the well-known passage in Irenæus, in which he speaks of Christ's advancing through infancy, youth, and manhood, saving all ages, by living and acting for all.† Both the perfect obedience of Christ, and the shedding of his blood as a ransom, unite in the system of Irenæus, but he seems to have held the idea of a sacrifice in the background. *Gregory of Nyssa*, mentions it, as an element in the work of redemption, that Christ maintained a pure disposition through all the moments of his life.‡ In the Scholastic age the active obe-

* *Buddæus*, Inst. Theol. Dog. Lib. IV. Sec. 37. Non tantum Christus passione et morte sua nostra peccata expiavit, sed per totam vitam, legem divinam pro nobis accuratissime implevit; et ita pro nobis satisfecit, dum non tantum sacrificio infiniti valoris iratum Deum placavit, sed et ea omnia accurate præstitit, quæ justitiâ divina hominum peccatis infinitum in modum laesa, exigere poterat; adeo ut omnis obligatio ad pœnam cesset, prorsusque sit sublata, Deus vero utpote hac ratione reconciliatus, omnia peccata, quæ admiserunt, modo vera fide meritum Christi apprehendant, illis remittere et condonare eosque in numerum filiorum suorum recipere paratus sit.

† Iren II. 224.

‡ Hagenbach, Hist. Doc. I. p. 380.

dience of Christ continued to hold a high place in theological representations of the Redeemer's vicarious work. So prominently did *Anselm* (A. D., 1093—1109,) make this, that in the history of doctrines it is made a question whether he did not altogether exclude the *Satisfactio passiva* from his view of Redemption.*

Some modern theologians, however, exclude the active obedience of Christ from being, immediately and in itself, a part of the ground of justification. They admit that this obedience was indeed necessary, but only, as a condition pre-requisite to fit him to offer a pure and acceptable sacrifice. Had He himself sinned, his sufferings could not be regarded as vicarious and accruing to the benefit of others. They connect his active obedience, not with the provision of a righteousness for us, but with his qualification to furnish an effectual vicarious sacrifice. A just and full view of Christ's work, as the ground of our justification must pronounce this theory defective and inadequate. If the doctrine is correct, which presents the righteousness by which we are justified, as not the intrinsic holiness of the Saviour's divine nature, but the *work done by him in his theanthropic Person, on behalf of sinners*, it follows directly and necessarily, that we must regard him as not only furnishing a basis of pardon by his innocent sufferings, but a ground of acceptance by fulfilling for us all righteousness. Hence whilst the Confession is silent on this precise point, the authors of the Form of Concord, who have most sharply and correctly presented the full doctrine of this Article, have included the *Satisfactio activa* in varied and emphatic phrase. They ground justification on "*the entire obedience of the whole Christ.*" They mention both his "obedience," and his "bitter sufferings," as included. "Faith looks upon the person of Christ, as the same was made under the law for us, bore our sins, and when proceeding to the Father rendered entire and perfect obedience to his heavenly Father for us poor sinners, from his holy birth unto his death; and thereby covered all our disobedience which inheres in our nature, in its thoughts, words and deeds." Hence that righteousness, which is imputed to faith, or to believers, before God, through grace alone, is the obedience, the sufferings, and

* See Neander, Hist. Dog. p. 517, and Hagenbach Hist. Doc. II. p. 38.

the resurrection of Christ, by which He has rendered complete satisfaction unto the law for us, and made expiation for our sins. For, since Christ is not only man, but God and man in one undivided person, He was as little subject to the law, being Lord of the law, as it would have been necessary for him to suffer and die for his own person. *His obedience, therefore, not only in suffering and dying, but in his being voluntarily put under the law in our stead, and fulfilling it with such obedience, is imputed unto us for righteousness; so that, for the sake of this perfect obedience, which He rendered unto his heavenly Father for us, in both doing and suffering, in his life and death, God forgives us our sins, accounts us as righteous and just, and saves us eternally.*"*

Scripture proof of the correctness of this view may be seen by a reference to a few passages. Rom. 5 : 19, St. Paul declares, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of One, shall many be made righteous." The reference is admitted to be to the justification of the sinner through Christ. Were it based on his *death* alone, the use of the different and comprehensive term *obedience*, would be unaccountable. It may, and must, indeed, be regarded as including his "*obedience unto death*," or his suffering, but refers more directly to the aggregate work of satisfying the demands of the law. From the antithesis of the word to the disobedience of Adam, his active obedience, rather than his sufferings, seems to be the prominent idea.† "The entire holy life of our Saviour," says Tholuck, "is termed *ὑπακοή*, embracing in indivisible unity what the Church has termed the *obedientia activa*, and *obedientia passiva*." In loco. In v. 18, the apostle expresses the same idea in another form: "By the righteousness, *δικαιώματος*, of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification, *δικαιωσιν*, of life." In this passage the term "*righteousness*," seems to be the equivalent of "*obedience*," in v. 19. They are alike connected with justification, and are terms of more comprehensive import than would have been used had the apostle nothing in his view but Christ's death. The same doctrine is implied in Ps. 40 : 8, compared with John 4 : 34-

3. It is completed in Christ's *passive obedience*. The Confession gives prominence to this because it presents the most central conception of the atonement. As the basis

* Form Con. Dec. Art. III.

† See Hodge in loco.

of justification it refers to the great unparalleled fact, "Christ suffered"—"made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death."

The most casual reading of the Scriptures is sufficient to impress every one with a conviction of the vital relation of Christ's sufferings and death with the sinner's salvation. Text follows text, and declaration is added to declaration, to keep Jesus before the sinner's view as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." The Old Testament points to this part of His mediatorial and saving work, in type and shadow, bleeding victims and smoking altars, temple arrangements and prophetic announcements. Isaiah directs to a suffering Saviour, stricken, smitten, making his soul an offering for sin, and justifying many because of bearing their iniquities. Daniel beholds him as cut off, but not for himself. In the New Testament we hear Christ himself declare, as He approaches the dreadful hour, "For this purpose I came unto this hour." And though his disciples at first could not understand this, and stumbled at it, after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, leading them into the truth, they were ready to exclaim, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ." They resolved to know nothing among men but Christ, and him crucified, and preached this as the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. It is made the ceaseless theme of the word of God.

The sufferings of the Redeemer have their relation to the punishment due our sins. As his life fulfilled all the requirements of the law in our stead, his agony and death satisfied all the penalty denounced upon our transgressions. "The wages of sin is death." But "when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly," Rom. 5 : 6. God "hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. 5 : 21. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many," Mat. 20 : 28. The Church is spoken of, as "the Church of God which He hath purchased with his own blood," Acts 20 : 28. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," Eph. 2 : 13. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3 : 25. "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," 1

Cor. 15 : 3. "Christ, our passover is sacrificed for us," 1 Cor. 5 : 7. "God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him," Rom. 5 : 8, 9. "We also joy in God, by whom we have now received the atonement," Rom. 5 : 11. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, He entered once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9 : 12. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," Heb. 9 : 28. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ," 1 Pet. 1 : 18, 19. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree," 1 Pet. 2 : 24. These passages, and many others, illuminating all the pages of the New Testament with the light of redemption, set forth unequivocally, and with all the fervor of the Gospel message, that Christ, in the unity of his two natures in one Person, and acting in a vicarious character, bore the curse and punishment due to us, expiated all our offences, honored and satisfied the law, so that God might be just and yet pardon and accept the ungodly.

The reason why, since the fall, such vicarious obedience and suffering are necessary to the sinner's forgiveness and salvation, is found in the necessity of maintaining the inviolable sanctity of the Divine law and holiness. The wicked could not be justified on the simple ground of repentance and reformation. Repentance and reformation can have no atoning power over the past. It can neither satisfy the penalty of the broken law, nor vindicate the holiness and justice of God against the fearful crime of already committed sin. God must "declare his righteousness," as well as set forth his mercy. Thus the glorious message of salvation, does not come as a departure from justice, or any relaxation of its demands, but offers its gracious blessings through the substitutionary fulfilment of both the practical and penal requirements of the law, by which mercy and truth have met together, and unite in perfect harmony.* "Once for all together, Christ has done

* Augustine, Ps. 100. Homines quando judicunt, aliquando victi misericordia faciunt contra justitiam, et videtur in eis esse misericor-

enough to remove the sins of all who come to him and believe on him." Luth. on 1 Pet. 3 : 18.

3. *The Nature of Justification.*

In the brief but clear terms of the Confession, amplified in the Apology and Form of Concord, the doctrine of the Gospel and of our Church on this point is most satisfactorily defined. Justification is mentioned as "the remission of sins," and the bestowal upon us of "righteousness and eternal life." The three essential elements of its nature are here involved :

1. Its judicial and objective character.* In this, it contains a clear and absolute repudiation of the theory, which had been maintained, and still is, by Romish, and some Protestant theologians. Over against all the notion of justification by an inherent righteousness, confounding justification with sanctification, the Reformers rigorously asserted the objective and forensic nature of this act, as an essential distinction in sound and Biblical Theology. Although the language of Melancthon, in the Apology, is,

dia et non esse iudicium, aliquando vero rigidum volentes tenere iudicium, perdunt misericordiam. Deus autem nec in bonitate misericordiae perdit iudicii severitatem, nec in iudicando cum severitate amittit misericordiae bonitatem.

* Chemnitz. Paulus articulum justificationis ubique describit tanquam processum iudicalem, quod conscientia peccatoris coram tribunali Dei lege divina accusata, convicta et sententiae aeternae damnationis subjecta, confugiens ad thronum gratiae restituitur, absolvitur et a sententia damnationis liberata, ad vitam aeternam acceptatur, propter damnationem et intercessionem filii Dei mediatoris, quae fide apprehenditur et applicatur.

Quenstedt, (III, 526). Justificatio est actus Sanctissimae Trinitatis externus, judicialis, graciosus, quo hominem peccatorem gratis propter Christi meritum fide apprehensum remissis peccatis, justum reputat, in gloriosae gratiae ac iustitiae laudem et justificatorum salutem.

Hollaz. Justificatio est actus judicialis isque graciosus, quo Deus satisfactione Christi reconciliatus peccatorem in Christum credentem, ab objectis criminibus absolvit et justum aestimat atque declarat. Quae actio, cum sit extra hominem in Deo, non potest hominem inrinsice mutare.

in a few cases, ambiguous on this point, undoubtedly the whole tenor of it, and many distinct and definitive passages, set forth its nature as outward and judicial. And the Form of Concord declares, "If we wish to retain in its purity the Article concerning justification, great diligence and care are to be observed, lest that which precedes faith and that which follows it, be at the same time intermingled and introduced into the article concerning justification, as necessary and pertaining to it. For it is not one and the same thing to speak of conversion and justification." "For, though the converted and believing have an incipient renewal, sanctification, love, virtue, and good works, yet these cannot and must not be referred to the article of justification before God, and confounded with it; so that Christ the Redeemer may not be deprived of his glory, and troubled consciences may not, since our new obedience is still imperfect and impure, be robbed of their sure consolation."

The proof of the external and forensic, or perhaps, more properly, *governmental*, nature of justification, is made manifest by a reference to a few passages of the Word of God. It is involved in the use of the word *to justify*. The Hebrew דָּיַק, translated by the Seventy into the Greek words, δικαιοῦν, δικαιοῦσθαι, δικαίον κρινεῖν, which are used in the New Testament to express this truth, includes the idea of an objective forensic acquittal.* Ex. 24 : 7, "I will not justify the wicked," refers to no inner change, but to a relation to the law. In Prov. 17 : 15, "He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the innocent are both an abomination in the sight of the Lord," the antithesis is between justification and condemnation, and both are objective in their character. In Matt. 12 : 37, "By thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned," there is no idea of an inner change, but a forensic decision. In Rom. 5 : 18, 19, and throughout the chapter, the nature of this doctrine is distinctly unfolded, and it is set forth in the clearest light as judicial and external. It is wrapped up in legal terms and relations. The phraseology implies a judge, guilt before the law, and

* דָּיַק in Kal est justitiam habere, in Piel justitiam alicui tribuere, in Hiphil in judicio aliquem absolvere et justitium pronunciare, in Hithpael, se ipsum justificare et causæ suæ bonitatem demonstrare. Gerh. Loc. Theol., Locus De Justificatione, Prooe. § III.

an acquittal, by virtue of "the righteousness of One" who has made an "atonement." The judgment is to condemnation, εἰς κατάρξιμα, the grace, to justification, εἰς δικαίωσις. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth," Rom. 8 : 33, implies a judicial accusation, and a free divine absolution. Most plainly is this aspect of truth included in the representation of justification in 2 Cor. 5 : 19—21: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. * * * For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." A correspondence is thus traced between it and the way in which Christ was made sin for us. We are made "righteousness" in Christ, in the same manner as he was made sin for us. But Christ was not made sin for us by actually becoming a sinner, but by bearing our sins imputatively. So we are justified, not by being made intrinsically righteous, or by an infusion, but only *actu forensi*.* In short, the word to justify, means, properly and generically, to pronounce any one righteous, either when he truly is so, or is really unrighteous. And it is to be remembered, that in the justification of the believer, the person is in fact a sinner, and the act is not a declaration of real moral character. It is not a divine judgment in reference to the moral condition of its object, but a holding of the truly guilty as acquitted for the sake of the vicarious sacrifice and righteousness of Jesus Christ.

2. It consists, partly, in pardon. "Forgiveness of sins before God,"—"for Christ's sake our sins are remitted to us,"—are the phrases in which our Confession describes it. The frequency with which it sets it forth by these terms, indicates how accurately and fully they were regarded as expressing its nature. Forgiveness of sins, and justification before God, are used as interchangeable terms, though in fact justification was acknowledged as including in its full meaning somewhat more than pardon. The Scriptures themselves use the word justification, as an equivalent to forgiveness. St. Paul, in describing justification, Rom. 4 : 7, 8, quotes as an Old Testament statement of it, the words of David, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the

* See Cotta's Note, Ger. Loci, Locus XVII.

man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." So, too, in Acts 13 : 38, 39 : "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." On the Divine basis of Christ's atonement, in which the penalty of sin has been suffered and the law satisfied, God freely forgives the penitent and believing sinner all his transgressions. On the ground of that death of the Just for the unjust, our offences are wholly blotted out. The sinner is pardoned, and looked upon, in Christ, as though he had never sinned. It is a full absolution. He is acquitted of all charges and released from all penalties. God no longer imputes, or charges, to the sinner the offences of which he had been guilty. There is now no *condemnation*, to them who are in Christ Jesus.

3. It is completed in the *imputation of Christ's righteousness*. This meets the necessities of the sinner's case, in a relation which reaches beyond the simple matter of pardon. Being forgiven, he is not left in the condition of a criminal merely released from punishment. He needs be held not only as absolved from wrath, but as having an acceptable righteousness. His condition must not be a mere negation, but one of positive fulness. Divested alike of his own sins and righteousness, he is not to be held henceforth as miserable and poor and naked, but as clothed in spotless garments and made rich indeed. Hence, in the very act of justification, along with the non-imputation of his sins, God imputes Christ's perfect righteousness to him. Thus, while pardon takes away from the sinner what he has, this imputation gives him what he has not. On one side the penalty of his transgressions is removed, and on the other, the complete righteousness of the Redeemer is placed to his account. The two sides of his need are thus fully met, in the substitutionary provision of saving grace. The accuracy and beauty of the language of the Confession is, therefore, plainly seen, when, in addition to pardon, it declares "righteousness and eternal life are bestowed upon us." "For God regards this faith, and imputes it as righteousness in his sight, Rom. III and IV."

This is the great doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which stands so centrally in the faith of orthodox Protestantism. It presents with vigor, that

grand and comforting truth of the Gospel, that the believer is "*complete* in Christ who is the Head of all principality and power." Able to work out for himself neither pardon nor righteousness, both are provided in the Saviour's work, and freely and fully bestowed upon him in justification. Merely to forgive the sinner, and let him go, would not be a restoration to the blessedness of the Divine favor from which he is fallen. He needs to be taken back, and treated as righteous, in the fulness of fellowship and love. He is not left poor, but made rich. "For your sakes He became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich," 2 Cor. 8 : 9. He is clothed in the wedding garment, Matt. 22 : 2—13. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth," Rom. 10 : 4. Instead of his own sin, the obedience of him who is "the Lord, our righteousness" is imputed to him. "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works," Rom. 4 : 3—6. The fact, that sometimes the "righteousness of Christ," and at other times, our "faith," is said to be imputed to us, involves no contradiction. For faith is introduced merely as apprehending and appropriating the righteousness which is then set down to our account. Moreover, in the distinction made, between pardon, and this imputation, we are not to suppose any real division of the act of justification. Though forgiveness of sins is based entirely on Christ's atoning work, and the imputation of his righteousness implies a reference to his whole obedience for us, our acceptance of Christ secures the benefit of both, which are thus united in the same act of justification. The one divine act of justification brings us both pardon of our past sins and the imputation of Christ's perfect righteousness. It is, also, in this way clearly distinguished from a divine judgment upon the intrinsic character of the sinner, and becomes a free declaration of a gracious absolution and acceptance of the really guilty. And the whole nature of the act is summed up vigorously in the Form of Concord, "We believe, teach, and confess * * * that poor sinful man is justified before God, that is, absolved

and declared free from his sins, and from the sentence of his well-deserved condemnation, and is adopted as a child and heir of eternal life, without any merit or worthiness, and without any antecedent, present, or subsequent works, out of pure grace, for the sake of the merit, the perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings and death, and resurrection of Christ our Lord alone, whose obedience is imputed unto us for righteousness."

4. *The Relation of Faith to Justification.*

The Confession declares we are justified "through faith, —*per fidem, durch den glauben*. These terms express the *instrumental cause* of justification. This point is of such vital importance, and lies so truly in the very heart of this great doctrine of our Church, that its meaning and relations cannot be too accurately and fully grasped. The very characterizing feature of the Gospel is, that it presents salvation as attained through faith. It so fully expresses the essence of the system, that "the faith," is made a synonym of Christianity. And both the object and the power of the Reformation, consisted in the disclosure of the full and indubitable relation of faith to the sinner's justification and salvation. There are three elements in which its nature and office are seen.

1. *Knowledge is implied.* This is the first element of the definition of the older theologians, in which faith is made to consist in knowledge, *notitia*, assent of the mind, *assensus*, and confidence or trust, *fiducia*. The definition is to be accepted as, in substance, correct, but it needs some guarding statements. Undoubtedly, the historical facts, and doctrinal verities of the Gospel, must be known before the sinner can accept the hope and blessings they offer. Men must know the truth, before it can make them free. "And this is eternal life, to know Thee the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," John 17 : 3. Conviction of sin and sense of spiritual need are divinely wrought through the truth in the hands of the Holy Spirit. Yet, however essential a knowledge of the objects of faith may be to its exercise, it is generically different from faith itself. It is rather a pre-requisite to faith. "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" Rom. 10 : 14. The contents of the logical understanding are not the same as an act of faith. And though our Saviour does speak of knowing, *γινώσκειν*, the true God and Jesus

Christ, as eternal life, the eternal life is not the *immediate* result of the knowledge, but the knowledge leads to faith, according to St. Paul's words to Timothy, "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, *through faith in Jesus Christ*," 2 Tim. 3 : 15. Men may have knowledge, even in richest stores, without a particle of real, saving faith. A mere acquaintance with the historical truths and wonderful doctrines of the Gospel, as treasures of the understanding, cannot, in itself, unite the human life to the life of Christ. On this point our Confessors fully rejected the Romish doctrine of the nature of faith. There had been no sharp or true distinction of essential faith from mere historical or doctrinal knowledge. "Our adversaries think that faith consists in knowledge of, or an acquaintance with, the history of Christ."* Art. XX, defining faith, declares, "The Scriptures, speaking of faith, do not style faith such a knowledge as devils and wicked men have; for it is taught concerning faith in Heb. 11 : 1, that a mere knowledge of the facts of history is not faith." The deep intensity of Luther's experience, in which he came into a true apprehension of the Gospel plan, and repose in Christ as his Saviour, necessarily led to a clear distinction of faith from this merely intellectual knowledge. It was impossible that he should teach a system in which these two things should be confounded. Melancthon's experience concurred with Luther's; and the frequency with which he repeats, in the Apology, the caution against mistaking knowledge for faith, discloses how strongly he wished to place the doctrine of the Gospel on this point over against the error of Rome.

2. It implies the assent of the understanding. These truths and doctrines of Christ must not only be known, but approved. Their excellence and adaptedness must be recognized, in an assenting judgment of the intellect. But here, as in knowledge, this assent is rather a condition precedent to saving faith than faith itself. It is what may be accurately designated as *historical faith*. It is a yielding of the judgment to the contents of the knowledge. "It is not enough for us to know and believe that Christ was born, that he suffered and rose from the dead."† This is

* Apol. Art. IV. (II).

† Apol. Art. IV.

a belief which the devils may have, without any submission of will or affections, to the terms of pardon and salvation. The assent of Reason to the truth, divinity and reliability of the remedial scheme of grace, though essential as a preliminary basis for the act of appropriating the offers of salvation, in which the essence of faith consists, must yet be regarded as but partial and inadequate. This represents the condition of the masses in Christian lands, who, intellectually admit and consent to the truth and excellence of Christianity, but who live in utter indifference and neglect of Christ and salvation. The reason of the inadequacy of this merely assenting judgment of the mind is plain. It lies altogether in the sphere of the natural. It is only the same kind of mental assent as is given to any other historical or scientific truths. It implies no supernatural operation, as a work of grace in the heart, and fails to surrender the affections and life to the power and control of Christ.

3. The essential thing, which itself constitutes the reality and fulness of faith is *Trust*, or *Confidence*. It is the *fidelucia* of the old theologians, and expresses the act in which the penitent reposes on the merit and grace of the Redeemer. In it he accepts Christ who is a perfect Saviour, and lays an appropriating hold of him, as He has been made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It brings the believing soul and Christ together. Faith takes Christ, just as he is offered, in all the fulness of his redemption and offices of salvation, and reposes in the infallible promises of his love. It is essentially appropriating act, and one of self-surrender; and whilst knowledge and assent belong wholly to the logical understanding, this surrender to Christ in confidence and reliance embraces the action of the will and the sensibilities. Hence St. Paul declares, with striking definiteness and force, "*With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.*"*

We must not fail to understand that this faith makes a real appropriation of the merit of Christ. It truly "puts on Christ." The imputation of his righteousness is not to be supposed to be based upon anything short of such a

* The error of Rome on this point is seen in the words of Bellarmin, Justif. 1 : 4, *Catholici fidem in intellectu sedem habere docent. Denique in ipso actu intellectus.*

vital union as is expressed by the apostle, "I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me, and the life I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." It is not by what faith *is*, that it justifies, but by what it embraces. It justifies not as a virtue, or intrinsic state of the soul, but as holding within its embrace Christ himself, in all his work and fulness. The Divine Judge does not set over to the believer's account, as a liquidation of his debt, and as accepted righteousness, what his faith has not really grasped. Faith must, therefore, be regarded as apprehending the gracious work and righteousness of Jesus Christ. Hence, Luther's expression, "Faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him enclosed, as the ring doth the precious stone. And whosoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ apprehended in the heart, him will God account for righteous." On Gal. 2 : 16. "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," 1 John 5 : 11. Hence it is, that "He that hath the Son hath life ; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life," 1 John 5 : 12. Yet it is not to be understood that it is *Christ's indwelling* that becomes the *ground* of justification, but thus we are put by faith, in such relation to him, that *His whole obedience, even unto death*, is imputed to us. It is through such a reception of him, in the act of faith, that we appropriate the benefits of his vicarious work.

The *particula exclusiva*, the expression *alone*, by which the Reformers guarded so jealously the purity of the relation of faith to justification, was not only demanded by the antagonism of Rome to it, but by the interests of the truth and the Church for all ages. Against all schemes that admitted anything before, after, or along side of Christ apprehended by a divinely wrought faith, it re-asserted the truth into which the Holy Ghost had guided the apostle Paul, Rom. 3 : 28, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

4. This faith is contemplated not as a product of nature, but as a gift of God. In Art. II, it is, in accordance with Scripture, declared that human nature, since the fall, is so under the power of original sin that it can, of its own accord, exercise no true faith in God. Consistently with this, the Apology, Art. IV, sets forth, "Faith is the accep-

tance of this treasure [Christ's merit] with our whole heart, and this is not our own act, present, or gift, our own work or preparation." "This faith is a gift of God, through which we rightly acknowledge Christ our Redeemer in the word of the Gospel, and confide in him."* It is our confessional response to the divine word, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," Eph. 2 : 8.

5. This act, as well as the subsequent life of faith, is to be rigorously separated from the idea of merit. Because of its instrumental relation, as conditioning our acceptance before God, there has been a disposition to look upon it as itself a good and meritorious work. There is no deserving worthiness in it. The only worthiness is in Christ, and faith, being itself God's gift, is only the hand that receives the blessings of redemption. Its only activity is that of accepting God's free salvation, and this activity itself is through the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit. The author of the Confession, therefore, defines: "Faith does not justify us before God, as though it were itself our work, but solely because it receives the grace promised and offered without merit, and presented out of the rich treasures of mercy."† This is fully accordant with the statements of Scripture and the conclusions of reason. Though faith be accepted and imputed for righteousness, it is still like every other grace in man, defective and incomplete, and, therefore, cannot become a foundation of confidence. So soon as the believer would trust to the worthiness of his faith, he would turn to something wrought within him and deny Christ as the only foundation. Melancthon, to J. Brentz, 1531, writes, "Faith alone justifies, not because it is the root, or is meritorious, but because it lays hold of Christ, for whose sake we are accepted."‡ The words of Luther to Brentz concur in satisfying us that this is the doctrine meant to be set forth by the Reformers:—"In order that I may have a better view of this thing, I am wont to think of myself as having in my heart no such quality as faith or love: but in place

* Form. Con.

† Apol. Art. IV.

‡ Ideo sola fide sumus iusti, non quia radix, ut tu scribis, sed quia apprehendit Christum, propter quem sumus accepti. Corp. Ref. II, 501,

of these, I put Christ himself, and say, 'This is my righteousness.' " *

6. In the nature of saving faith, is included, finally, an energy of spiritual transformation and fruitfulness. Though carefully distinguishing between justification, and the spiritual change with which it is connected, our doctrine unequivocally asserts, that no other faith becomes the instrument of justification than a living and transforming one. It fully includes the truth of St. James, "Faith without works is dead." It is no real and living recipient. Though the holiness and works wrought by faith have no merit, and are not to be mistaken as forming any part of the ground of justification, yet the faith that does really embrace Christ, does, and must work by love and purify the heart. "We speak of faith," says the Apology, "as being not an idle fancy, but a new light, life, and power in the heart, that renews the heart and disposition, transforms man into a new creature." "Faith wherever, and while it exists, bears good fruit." "Love and works must follow faith." These are its evidences and seals. They prove its presence, reality and power, as springing grain and blooming flowers prove the presence and power of spring.

But as the connection of faith with good works, forms the special subject of Art. XX, no further discussion of it is here needed, than this simple statement of the kind of faith referred to by our Confession in the doctrine of this Article

We have thus recalled the teaching of this Article on the great subject which it sets forth. Together with an utter repudiation of the destructive error of Rome, it declares, in brief, but bold outline, the true doctrine of the Gospel and of our Church. It presents the *Source* of Justification wholly in the free grace of God. It asserts the only *Ground* of it to be found in the work of Jesus Christ, who, as the Godman, taking the sinner's place, by his vicarious obedience and suffering, made satisfaction to justice and violated law and brought in, for the guilty, a perfect and everlasting righteousness. The *Nature* of it is not that of an internal change, but a forensic, or governmental absolution of the punishment due to sin, together with an imputation of Christ's finished righteousness. This pardon and imputation are conditioned solely in a hearty re-

* Neander Hist. Dog. p. 663.

ception of Christ, in a faith which is itself the gift of God, not meritorious, but living and transforming. And thus pardoned and accepted for Christ's sake in *justification*, the same faith to which all this is graciously given, takes Christ also for *sanctification*, in which, as a divine internal operation, generically distinct from the forensic act of justification, the forgiven sinner becomes a new creature in Christ, and is made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

It only remains now, in conclusion, to note, briefly, the harmony of other Confessions and orthodox Churches in the essential features of this doctrine, with their variations and differences from it in some of its aspects; and especially, to trace how absolutely and sharply it cuts off from itself and rejects the various errors of heterodox sects.

This is one of the great doctrines in which the Protestant Churches are essentially agreed. The Augsburg Confession, in accordance with the grand design of Luther, Melancthon, and their co-laborers, was meant to set forth the broad, clear, and full doctrines of the Gospel in their true catholicity. The Augsburg Confession concludes with this assurance of its own design, "That it might be clearly perceived, that by us nothing is received either in doctrine or ceremonies, which might be contrary to the Holy Scriptures, or opposed to the universal Church." The denominational idea was unknown to them; and in declaring the truth of the Gospel, they designed the reformation of the aggregate church, and its restoration, in its universality, to its old foundations. Whilst, therefore, from its honorable priority, our Church, in its great Confession, took no denominational position, and gave itself no denominational marks and peculiarities, others co-laboring in the general reformatory aim, but, as we conceive, on narrower ground, framed for themselves more exclusive creeds and defined their position in denominational separation from the Augustana. It is to be regretted, that subsequently, a part of our Church, forsaking its original conception of embodying only the fundamental truths of revived universal Christianity, and accepting the partizan, or denominational idea, sought in the Form of Concord to narrow our confessional basis, and define and restrict it in partizan and non-fundamental limitations. Yet the different denominations that separated by distinctive confessional tenets from the general Confession

at Augsburg, have accepted, with hardly a variation, the great and central doctrine of this Article.

This happy agreement is made manifest by an examination of some of the principal Confessions of the different Reformed and Calvinistic Churches, which took a doctrinal position denominationally distinct from the Church of the Augsburg Confession.

The *Confession of Basle*, 1547, Art. IX, declares, "We acknowledge the forgiveness of sins through faith in Jesus Christ, the crucified One. Though this faith continually exercises, and manifests itself, by works of love, we do not ascribe righteousness and satisfaction for our sins to these works which are fruits of faith; but solely to true confidence and faith in the shed blood of the Lamb of God."*

The *Gallican Confession*, adopted by the Reformed Church in France, 1559, Art. XVIII, says, "We rely upon the obedience of Christ alone, which is imputed to us, so that all our sins are covered, and we attain favor before God. Art. XX, "We believe that we become partakers of Christ's righteousness by faith alone * * * and this occurs in such a way that the promises of life offered to us in him (Christ) are then applied to our use and rendered efficacious to us, when we embrace them, not doubting that those things will be fulfilled to us, of which we have been assured by the mouth of God."†

* Confitemur remissionem peccatorum per fidem in Jesum Christum crucifixum. Et quamvis haec Fides per opera charitatis, se sine intermissione exercet, exerit, atque ita probatur: attamen justitiam et satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris, non tribuimus operibus, quae Fidei fructus sunt; sed tantum verae fiduciae et fidei, in effusum sanguinem Agni Dei. Quoted from Niemeyer, *Coll. Confess. Ref.* p. 98.

† Art. XVIII, In sola Christi obedientia prorsus acquiescimus, quae quidem nobis imputantur, tum et tegantur omnia nostra peccato, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo nanciscamur. Art. XX, Credimus, nos sola fide fieri justitiae participes: * * * hoc autem ideo fit, quod promissiones vitae nobis in ipso (Christo) oblatæ tunc usui nostro applicantur et nobis redduntur efficaces, cum eas amplectimur, nihil ambigentes nobis obventura, de quibus ore Dei certiores fimus. Quoted from Winer, *Dartstel. Des Lehrbegriffs*, pp. 96, 99.

In the *Palatine, or Heidelberg Catechism*, 1563, probably the most important of all the Reformed Confessions, Question 60, "How art thou justified before God?" is answered: "Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ; so that though my conscience accuse me that I have grossly transgressed all the commands of God, and kept none of them, and am still inclined to all evil; notwithstanding God, without any merit of mine, but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ; even so, as if I never had had, nor committed any sin; yea, as if I had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ hath accomplished for me; inasmuch as I embrace such benefit with a believing heart."*

In its definition of Faith, it declares, "It is not only a certain knowledge, whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His word, but also an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the Gospel in my heart; that not only to others but to me also, remission of sin, everlasting righteousness, and salvation, are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits."

The Second Helvetic Confession, 1566, declares: "To justify is to remit sins, absolve from guilt and punishment, to receive into favor and declare righteous. * * * For Christ, having taken the sins of the world upon himself, made satisfaction for them to divine justice. Therefore, on account of Christ alone, who suffered and rose, God is merciful to our unrighteousness, and does not impute our sins unto us, but imputes to us the righteousness of Christ. * * * But since we receive this justification, not through any works, but through faith in Christ and the mercy of God, so we teach and believe with the Apostle, that the sinner is justified by faith alone in

* Sola fide Iesum Christum, adeo ut licet mea me conscientia accuset, quod adversus omnia mandata Dei graviter peccaverim, nec ullum eorum servaverim, adhaec etiamnum ad omne malum propensus sim, nihilominus tamen, (modo haec beneficia vera animi fiducia amplectar,) sine ullo meo merito, ex mera Dei misericordia, mihi perfecta satisfactio, justitia et sanctitas Christi, imputetur ac donetur; perinde ac si nec ullum ipse peccatum admissem, nec ulla mihi labes inhaereret; imo vero quasi eam obedientiam, quam pro me Christus praestitit, ipse perfecte praestitissem. From Niemeyer, Coll. Conf. Ref.

Christ, not by the law or by any works, * * because faith receives Christ as our righteousness, and attributes all things to the grace of God in Christ; so that justification is attributed to faith, altogether on account of Christ, and not as our own work. For it is the gift of God.”*

In the *Thirty-Nine Articles* of the Church of England, 1562, the definition of Justification, according to Dr. Short,† was probably derived from Melancthon’s *Loci Communes*, and thus closely harmonizes with the Augustana, in the declaration: “We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works and deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.”

The *Westminster Confession*, 1647, Chap. XI, puts the doctrine into minute specifications: “Those whom God effectually calls, He also freely justifies; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for any work wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is alone the instrument of justification; yet it is

* *Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et poena absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare. * * * Etenim Christus peccata mundi in se recepit et sustulit, divinaeque justitiae satisfecit. Deus ergo propter solum Christum passum et resuscitatum, propitius est peccatis nostris nec illa nobis imputat, imputat autem justitiam Christo pro nostra. * * Quoniam verò nos justificationem hanc recepimus, non per ulla opera, sed per fidem in Dei misericordiam et Christum, ideo docemus et credimus cum Apostolo, hominem peccatorem justificare solo fide in Christum, non lege, aut ullis operibus: quia fides Christum justitiam nostram recepit et gratiae Dei in Christo omnia tribuit, ideo fidei tribuitur justificatio, maxime propter Christum, et non ideo, quia nostrum opus est. Donum enim Dei est. Niemyer, Coll. Conf. p. 494.*

† Hist. Ch. of Eng. Chap. VI.

not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love."

This doctrine is expressed in similar terms in the *First Helvetic Confession*, 1536, the *Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549, the *Genevan Catechism*, 1545, the *Belgic Confession*, 1562, the *Bohemian*, 1535, the *Remonstrant*, and other Confessions. They all agree in representing justification, over against the teaching of Rome, as a Divine act, forensic in its character, based alone on the work and merit of Christ, through a true faith that apprehends and appropriates his vicarious obedience unto death, attended with renewal and good works, which, without forming in us the least merit, yet become the needed witness of the reality and power of the saving faith. This great heart-doctrine of the Reformation, in which revived Christianity re-asserted itself, has, therefore, flowed out, in its essential forms, from the great Confession at Augsburg, and become the inheritance of all orthodox Protestantism.

It must be noted, however, as necessary to a true and full view of this point, that though the article of justification, in its separate form is thus found to agree in these various creeds, yet placed in the midst of a low Arminian theory, on the one hand, or of the rigid Calvinistic system, on the other, the doctrine has a somewhat different significance and import. It stands in the midst of different relations, and becomes theologically modified by its bearings as viewed from a new stand-point. Thus, Arminianism, with its semi-naturalism and undue exaltation of human ability, diminishes the divine grace of the act of justification, under self-complacent and unscriptural notions of working out our own salvation. And in the scheme of an absolute Predestination, justification by faith, instead of being central in the economy of salvation, is forced into a merely subordinate place. It does not present the pivoting point on which a sinner's free and gracious salvation really turns, or where God's grace meeting human freedom, personal salvation is determined in the issue. It is not, as it is in the Lutheran theology, the presentation of an open door, where there is entrance provided and offered to a world of perishing men, redeemed by Jesus' blood. But it is simply a fixed and subordinate divine act, carrying out a particular divine decree of grace to the individual. The decree of predestination meets us at the outset,

settling, at the very beginning, the final destiny of the elect person. From this *decree* everything takes start, by it everything is shaped, and has its significance. Personal salvation stands, from the first, in the pronounced fiat of a Sovereign Will. The hidden decree has fixed everything ; and the incarnation and death of Christ for the elect alone, the Gospel call, irresistible grace, justification and sanctification, come in simply as carrying out the decisive decree.* Hence, the Westminster Confession, with the rigorous logic that bends all parts into the harmony of the system, adds to the part already quoted on this subject, "God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect ; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification : nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them." The offer of the Gospel, therefore, is not thus a presentation of an open privilege through justification, in which their salvation may be decided, as the point where Divine grace comes to human freedom, in a mysterious but real opportunity whose issue determines the question of personal salvation or ruin. It is simply an included step in the sinner's already settled way to heaven. For it is to be remembered that the Divine decrees, in this system, refer primarily not to any gift of grace to be offered to the sinner's acceptance in Christ, but to the final destiny itself. Leaping over all the intermediate space, they decide the end itself. In this, we conceive, the Gospel offer of free justification loses its significance as

* In confirmation of this statement, see Dr. A. A. Hodge, on The Atonement, p. 389. "The entire analogy and spirit of Calvin's system was, as a whole, broadly characterized by the subjection of Redemption to Election as a means to an end. The able, learned and impartial F. Christian Baur, in his History of the Atonement, (A. D., 1838,) says : 'Zwingle and Calvin did indeed adhere to the dogma of Satisfaction in its traditional form ; but from their point of view, the Satisfaction itself was subsumed under the idea of the absolute decree, in relation to which the satisfaction of Christ was not the *causa meritoria* of salvation, but only the *causa instrumentalis* carrying out the purpose of redemption.' That this is true, so far as it represents Calvin subordinating the purpose of redemption to the purpose of election, every student of his *Institutes* and of his *Consensus Genevensis*, knows."

presenting the deciding point in the matter of salvation. In the Scriptural predestination, as it appears to us to be correctly taught by our Church,—“elect according to foreknowledge,”—“Whom He did foreknow, he did also predestinate,” in which the Divine decree is conditioned in foreknowledge, and not foreknowledge on the decree,—justification by faith is the point where a redeemed race may come and realize forgiveness and salvation. But in the Calvinistic system, it presents no such free privilege, save to the elect, and even in their case it is a point that *decides* nothing. The decision was fixed before, and this is only a stadium on the way. The Article of justification is shorn of its grand importance and its decisive relation. It is no longer the characterizing doctrine of the scheme of grace.

But in the doctrine of this Article, it is seen how rigorously and fully our Church bears testimony against all the *heresies* that have appeared on this subject in the history of Christianity. Its clear and decisive teaching cuts them all off in the sharpest rejection. It has already appeared how the deadly errors of Rome have been excluded. The *Symbol of the Greek Church* gives no definition of the doctrine.* According to *Kirspinski*, however, the form of Justification is made to consist in the forgiveness of sins, and a *change of the heart to holiness*. This constitutes it, in part, internal and transitive, and involves the very root of all the rejected Romish errors.

The error of the *Anabaptists*, who, in accordance with their fanatical subjective system, made justification an inward change to purity, is witnessed against in this Article.

The same is true of the *Schwenkfeldian* view, which taught that the righteousness of faith is not to be thought of as something existing without us in Christ, but as really implanted with Christ in our hearts and souls, through faith, so that it dwells in us, and we are thereby inwardly renewed.

The teaching of *Osiander*, who, starting with Luther's frequent statement, that faith becomes the medium of the real indwelling of Christ, maintained that the righteousness of Christ thus passes into the inner life of the believer, who is thus justified, not by the *imputation* of Christ's righte-

* See Winer, *Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs*, p. 95.

ousness, but by a real *communication* of it, is excluded by the doctrine of our Church.

The *Socinians* rightly regarded justification as a legal transaction, and, as to its objective character, maintained the Evangelical view, but by their rejection of the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice, they have left no ground for any pardon and justification, and this truth becomes untruth in their system.

The *Mennonites*,* and the *Quakers*,† both have fallen into the common error of heresy, placing justification in the work wrought within the believer, and confounding it with renewal and sanctification. As is well illustrated in the history of these sects, nothing can save any system embodying such an error at its very heart, from degenerating into multiform incongruities and distortions.

It is thus apparent that every form of false and destructive teaching on this subject includes one or more of the following errors: 1. Rejection of the vicarious atonement and obedience of Christ, as in Arian or Unitarian theologies, leaving no divine or possible ground of justification; 2. Pelagian exaltation of human ability, and reliance on human strength and works; 3. Denial of the purely forensic character of justification; 4. Making its nature consist in an internal change, according to some modification of the idea of an indwelling righteousness, thus confounding it with sanctification, and shutting out the penitent sinner from any hope of acceptance, save on the ground, or in view of, the holy life wrought within him.

Our Confession, however, maintains the positive truths that stand opposed to each and all of these errors, and insists on the central position and characterizing nature of justification by faith, in the Gospel of salvation. We rejoice in the historical priority and pre-eminence which Providence has given our Church in recovering this doctrine, in its purity and power, to Christendom, from under the perversions of the Romish apostacy, and setting it forth again, as showing the open way of salvation, to a perishing world. We are glad of this great heritage. And we know of no more fitting language with which to conclude this discussion, than the ringing words of Luther in the Smalcald Articles: "Upon this Article depends all

* Reis, Conf. Art. XXI, (Winer, p. 96.)

† Barclarii, Apol. 7 : 3, p. 128.

that we teach and do against the Pope, the devil, and the world." "Whatever may happen, though heaven and earth should fall, nothing in this article can be rescinded or repealed." Part II. Art. I.

ARTICLE II.

THE SABBATH QUESTION, IN ITS HISTORICAL RELATIONS, AND BEARINGS UPON THE FAITH AND LIFE OF THE CHURCH.

By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Phillipsburg, Pa.

The views which have been entertained, concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, may be arranged under three classes: 1. The Antinomian; 2. The Sabbatarian; 3. The Dominical. In the present Article, we propose, first, to ascertain the position held by these several forms of doctrine, and then, to examine them, with special reference to some of their historical relations, and practical bearings upon the life and the faith of the Church.

I. THE ANTINOMIAN VIEW.

This view ignores all distinctions of times. It declares that, inasmuch as all days are alike, we need no fixed day for religious worship. Sunday requires no observance different from other days. There can be nothing sinful in devoting it to the pursuit of ordinary business. The Lord's Day, as a special season for the contemplation of Divine truth, is a remnant of Judaism, which we should reject and despise. It may be kept as a holiday for recreation and relaxation; but, to give more attention to the truth on this day than on others, is not only unnecessary, but even preposterous.

This doctrine was first taught by Anabaptists and Antinomians, about the time of the Reformation, and has more recently found advocates in some who talk about a religious non-observance of the Lord's Day. It is supported by the arguments ordinarily employed, on this subject, by German Rationalists, and those in our own country, who would strike all Sunday laws from our statute-books, and make the day one of feasting and frolic, or business.

II. THE SABBATARIAN VIEW:

This phase of doctrine exists in three different forms:

1. *Strict Sabbatarianism* makes no distinction between the Lord's Day and the Jewish Sabbath. Not only does it insist upon a divine obligation to devote one day in seven to worship, but regarding the Third Commandment as throughout moral, contends that the seventh day must be sanctified, with all the circumstances of time, and mode of observance, which were binding under the Old Dispensation.

2. *Puritanic Sabbatarianism* recognizes a ceremonial element in the Third Commandment, but maintains, that this has reference only to the particular day of the week, which is to be observed. The Sabbath has not been abrogated; but has been transferred from Saturday to Sunday, and, therefore, the Lord's Day and the Sabbath are identical institutions. The Westminster Larger Catechism thus expresses it: "The Fourth Commandment requireth of all men the sanctifying or keeping holy to God, such set times as He hath appointed in his Word, expressly one whole day in seven; which was the seventh, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week ever since, and so to continue to the end of the world; which is the Christian Sabbath, and in the New Testament called *the Lord's Day*." Regarding the Lord's Day in this light, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that all the regulations, in reference to the observance of the Sabbath, contained in the Old Testament, must still remain in force. "The Sabbath or Lord's Day, is to be sanctified by an holy resting all that day, not only from such works as are at all times sinful, but even from such worldly employments and recreations, as are on other days lawful; and making it our delight to spend the *whole* time (except so much of it, as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy), in the public and private exercises of God's house." This form of Sabbatarianism is frequently carried very far, and becomes very exacting, as may be seen by a reference to the history of the New England colonies, where Puritanism flourished in its normal form. For the sake of illustration, we need only cite several sections from the code of laws, prepared for the government of the colonies of Massachusetts and New Haven. Among articles drawn up for the former colony by John

Cotton, is the following, which is quoted in Barber's History of Connecticut, as in force also in the latter colony : "No one shall run on the Sabbath day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting." In Hinman's Blue Laws of Connecticut, are, also, found the following sections, from Governor Eaton's Code for New Haven, (1656,) "38. If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife her husband on the Lord's Day, the party in fault, shall be punished at the discretion of the magistrate." "28. Whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day or any part of it, by work or sport, shall be punished by fine or corporally. But if the Court, by clear evidence find that the sin was *proudly, presumptuously*, and with a *high* hand committed against the command and authority of the Blessed God, such person therein reproaching the Lord shall be put to death."* It would not be difficult to multiply evidences of similar extravagancies.

Many of those adhering to this doctrine concerning the Sabbath, consider the ringing of a bell for assembling congregations on the Lord's Day, as a grievous sin; and in the same manner regard the use of a musical instrument, even though it be for the purpose of assisting worshippers in their devotions. It is mentioned by the biographer of an eminent English authoress, as one of her excellences, that she was never seen to smile on the "Sabbath." In our own experience, we have known those who, adopting this Puritanic view, have actually suffered from cold on the Lord's Day, fearing that by kindling a fire, they would transgress the Third Commandment. One who may read these lines, will perhaps remember a string which, on a Lord's Day, he determined to take from the floor, but which a conscience perverted by this form of Sabbatarianism compelled him to leave until the morrow; checking him in the very attempt, with the admonition that he was about performing what was neither a work of necessity, nor mercy, nor worship. At one of the leading institu-

* For a thorough examination of the genuineness of these articles, see "The Bampton Lectures for 1860", by Dr. Hesse, a store-house of facts, which is invaluable to all who desire to investigate this question with any thoroughness. Hinman's collection of "Blue Laws," is to be carefully distinguished from the fabrications of Peters. See article on the Blue Laws of Connecticut, by Rev. E. H. Gillett, D. D., in N. Y. Observer, for July 15th, 1869.

tions of learning in this country, it was formerly maintained, that the reading of the historical books of the Bible, on the Lord's Day, was a violation of the Third Commandment.

3. *Mild Sabbatarianism.* The legal strictness of Puritanic Sabbatarianism is rejected by a great many who still persist in identifying the Lord's Day with the Sabbath. They maintain that the Sabbath is an institution of universal moral obligation; but at the same time, that it is to be celebrated in the spirit of Gospel liberty. They reject the doctrine which teaches the abrogation of the Sabbath, because they fear that the belief of such a doctrine, will weaken the regard, with which we should consider the the Lord's Day; but at the same time, in order to justify them in their necessary departure from the strictness of the letter of the Jewish Sabbath laws, they appeal to the example of Christ, who taught that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. The scrupulouness of Puritanism, they condemn as a splitting of hairs, a straining at gnats, "Pharisaic nicety about the letter," but they have no less abhorrence to Dominicalism, which they regard as the source of the grossest Antinomian license. They are rigid in insisting upon the necessity of a Sabbath under the Christian dispensation; but believe that Gospel liberty has removed the yoke of much that was annoying and inconvenient, in the Sabbath of the Old Dispensation.

III. THE DOMINICAL VIEW.

Those who may be comprehended under the name of Dominicals, believe that the Sabbath was an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law. The Word of God, they maintain, both in the Old and the New Testament, declares it to be such; and the texts, by which ordinances of the Moral Law are to be determined, utterly fail when applied here. There is no argument, they declare, adduced to prove the perpetuity of this day, which remains after careful, thorough, impartial scrutiny.

But Dominicalism is not Antinomianism. It does not seek to undermine the authority of the Lord's Day, but simply to put it upon its true basis, so that its claims may be more universally acknowledged, and the true sanctification of the day more fully promoted. It regards the proper observance of the Lord's Day, as a "*signum aut*

stantis aut cadentis Christiani." All who may be classed as Dominicals, although differing on minor points, agree in this, viz.: that a stated day for rest and worship is needed. Some ground the necessity for the observance of the Lord's Day, upon the practice of Christ and the Apostles, which they regard, as in itself involving a command. Others refer it to a positive enactment of the Church, which, say they, being guided by the Holy Ghost, can at any time impose upon its members rules of faith and life of no less binding authority, than those contained in the Word of God.

Still others, regarding the day solely in its relations to the Word, consider their duty to observe the Lord's Day, to be derived from the necessity of setting apart some time for the exercises of devotion; this time must be fixed; and as the Church following the example of the Lord, (which, however, was not intended in the light of a command, but simply in that of a ratification of what the infant Church had already done), has set apart the first day of the week for this purpose, the observance of this appointment is binding upon all, on account of the disorder which a disregard of it would introduce into the Church.

Neither is Dominicalism a unit, as to the manner in which the whole day is to be employed. All its adherents maintain the necessity of entire rest from ordinary employments. All business transactions are contrary to its teachings. But within this limit, there is a variety, in the strictness, with which the day is observed. Some attach all its importance to the public preaching of the Word, and the other exercises of the sanctuary; and, therefore, discourage public transactions, solely on account of the effect which they would have, in preventing those engaged in business, from attending the house of God. Whilst they, therefore, condemn the Antinomian position, they have no hesitancy in making the Lord's Day, a day of relaxation and enjoyment. They attend worship at the stated hours; but do not think it wrong to fill up the interval, with social calls and such amusements, as would be proper on a mere holiday.

Others, believing that the benefit to be derived from the services of the sanctuary, is hindered by such devotion of the hours intervening between worship, to recreation, regard the Lord's Day as a period, in which we are not only to attend the house of God, but also to refrain from every-

thing which would distract the mind, from the consideration of the truth which is there heard. Innocent as certain relaxations may be, the transition between them, and the solemn acts of divine worship, is too great to be allowed in the space of a few hours. A day devoted jointly to divine worship, and the more trifling affairs of life, will so associate the Word, with what is light and trivial, as to deprive it of all its solemnity. Although the true child of God will engage in nothing, upon which he cannot ask his Father's blessing, yet, it is manifest, that certain frames of mind perfectly proper at times, are very unsuitable to those who are about to engage in the special contemplation of Divine truth. He who devotes the portions of Good Friday which intervene between the hours of worship, to social relaxation and enjoyment proper at other times, will lose much of the practical benefit derived from the consideration of the great truth, which that day commemorates. Of little profit, are the services of the sanctuary to those who do not seek them with prepared minds, or, who, instead of hiding the word in their hearts, immediately plunge into such a round of pleasure, as to lead them to forget what they had learned, or if not, to prevent all self-examination according to the truth as heard, or all testing by God's Word, as to whether the words of man actually are, what they claim to be, the words of God.

Many Dominicals likewise maintain, that the Lord's Day should also be devoted to private worship, in which the current of worldiness may be broken, and the mind give that time and attention to the study of the Scriptures, and private meditation and prayer, which the duties of the week prevent. They claim for this observance of the Lord's Day, Apostolic example, Rev. 1 : 10. Exclusive of worldly occupations and enjoyments, as this form of Dominicalism, is, the difference between it, and the stricter forms of Sabbatarianism, is very marked, inasmuch as the one, notwithstanding its protest, still labors under the burden of the Law, whilst the other rejoices in the glorious freedom of the Gospel: the one abstains from worldly pleasures, on account of fear; the other, on account of love: the one is constrained by necessity; the other, by pure delight: the strict Sabbatarian observes the "Sabbath," because he feels that he must: the other, the Lord's Day, because the soul which longs for God, bounds with pleasure

to its Master's worship. The one thinks chiefly of the day; the other, of the Word, with which the day is occupied.

The position of the Lutheran Church, as set forth in the Confessions, so far as the origin of the Lord's Day is concerned, is that of those who keep the day, solely on account of the necessity of a uniform time for Divine worship. A comparison of the explanations of the Third Commandment, found in Luther's Small Catechism, and the Westminster Shorter Catechism, shows the difference between Lutheran Dominicalism and Sabbatarianism:

LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM.

What is meant by this Commandment?

A. We should so fear and love God, as not to despise His word and the preaching of the Gospel, but deem it holy, and willingly learn it.

WESTMINSTER SHORTER CATECHISM.

What is required in the Fourth Commandment?

A. The Fourth Commandment requireth the keeping holy to God, such set times as He hath appointed in His word; expressly one day in seven to be a holy Sabbath to Himself.

Luther's Larger Catechism. We keep the holy days (G. *Feiertage*, L. *Festos Dies*) * * * * chiefly for this reason, that, on such day of rest (G. *Rugetage*, L. *Sabbati*),* inasmuch as otherwise there is no room for this, leisure and time may be taken for divine worship, so that we may assemble to hear and consider the word of God, and likewise praise God, in hymns, canticles and prayers. But with us this is not so bound to certain days, as it was with the Jews, so that this or that day must be afforded; for no day is better or more excellent than another. This indeed ought to be done daily, but since the mass of people, occupied with business, cannot afford it, at least one day in the week, should be devoted to this service, and as those who have preceded us, have set apart the Lord's

* It is worthy of remark, that whilst the Latin of the Larger Catechism refers to the Lord's Day as a *Sabbatum*, the original German carefully avoids the term Sabbath. A comparison of the Third Commandment as found in the Catechisms, compared with it, as rendered in Luther's translation of Exodus XX, in the German Bible, shows us what in this Commandment, he regarded as ceremonial and what as moral.

GERMAN BIBLE.

Ex. XX : 8, *Gedenke des Sabbathtages das du ihn heiligest.*

CATECHISMS.

Du sollt den Feiertag heiligen.

Day, this harmless custom of the ancients, already received, inasmuch as it has been universally adopted should, not be rashly changed, lest some one, by his unnecessary innovation, may disturb all things."

The Larger Catechism condemns the opinion extensively prevalent, that the day was truly sanctified by a hearing of one mass, or the Gospels on Sundays. "Know that it is not sufficient for us to hear only; we should also learn and observe: and think not, that it is left to your discretion, or that little depends on it, but that it is God's commandment, who will require of you, how you have heard, learned and honored His Word." But our Church does not define the extent to which we should refrain on the Lord's Day, from everything which is not directly connected with the contemplation of Divine truth. This she leaves to Christian liberty. She is unwilling to lay down any rule, which, while it might prove of advantage to some, would be an unnecessary burden to others.* An enlightened Christian conscience delighting in God's service, she esteems in this case, a sufficient guide; and, hence, is unwilling to obscure the Word of God, by adding to it human traditions. All that she asks, is that her children upon the Lord's Day, render the Word of God that honor, which is its due. Her position often so grossly misunderstood and perverted, notwithstanding the clear testimony which she has given, has thus been expressed by one of the authors of the Form of Concord: "It is, therefore, profitable for meditation and edification, that one day in the week be so devoted to worship, that on it no work be performed, or business undertaken, which, as in a sacred assembly, does not belong to the hearing of the Word, the partaking of the Sacraments, public prayers, thanksgiving, bestowal of alms, and other exercises of devotion. We should then, also, abstain from other works and business interfering with the public ministry, lest these exercises should disturb or interrupt us, by some hindrance or distraction."†

Relation of these Views, to the Systems of Doctrine, which they Represent.

All truth is a unit. An error in doctrine on the least

* *Vide* Augsburg Confession, XXVIII : § 63, 64.

† Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridenti. Chapter, De Diebus Festis.*

point, bears a certain relation to an error, on a point more important. There is no error so small as to be unimportant. Small as it may appear, it is either the outcropping of an extensive latitudinarian tendency, or the germ of fruit, which hereafter may develop itself unto death.

In examining, therefore, a man's views on any point of doctrine, we will find them to depend largely upon his belief on other doctrinal points, unless he have no system, his opinions being a melange, composed of the view of one teacher on one point, and another teacher on another point, without any consideration of the gross inconsistencies which may exist between the two. The creed of every reflecting man, has, however, a certain consistency. This, it is true, is not so perfect in all its parts, that from our knowledge of the form of one member, we can construct the whole body; for just as all truth is a unit, so, also, there is a certain inconsistency in all error, as not all error is pure error, but has certain particles of truth mingled with it. We do not propose, therefore, from his views concerning the Sabbath, to construct the system of doctrine which any one may hold, but simply to deal with facts, in an examination of the relationship which these several views, bear to the creeds of those, by whom they are advocated.

Anabaptism and Antinomianism.

The view of the Sabbath, professed by many of the Anabaptists, is in perfect harmony with the general character of their expressed belief on other articles. An extreme spiritualizing tendency underlies the whole system. In its professed zeal for the spirit of Christianity, it overlooks the letter, imagining that, as the essence of religion consists entirely in that which lies within, the observance of all external rites and ordinances must be omitted. This system entirely ignores the fact, that there is a sphere, in which the inner and spiritual, is acted upon and developed, only through that which is external and in a certain sense, material. Just as the Anabaptists deny the practical necessity of a day of rest and worship, and despise the Lord's Day, as an outward thing of no importance to Christians, so, also, they maintain, that the outward Word of God, is not necessary, but that the Holy Ghost is imparted, independently of the means of grace, through the inner light of Christ in man. Here we find a violation

of the moral element of the Third Commandment, a despising of God's Word and the preaching of the Gospel. The low place which they give to the external Word, is thus seen to be the true source of their opposition, to the proper observance of the Lord's Day, inasmuch as it leads them to esteem all days, for the study and consideration of this Word, as of no importance.

So, also, their doctrine which teaches that some men may attain to such perfection in this life, that they cannot sin, and their fanatical dreams concerning a reign of the saints upon earth prior to the second coming of Christ, harmonize with their view of the Lord's Day, inasmuch as their position on all these points, implies belief in the attainment of such a state in this life, that the worldly may be entirely absorbed in the spiritual.

In keeping too with their position in regard to the Lord's Day, is that which they have taken, concerning all other appointments, for the preservation of order. They thus have carried the freedom of the Gospel into licentiousness, esteeming the ministry of little importance, exalting a fancied inner above the outward call, despising ordination, and abusing the doctrine concerning the universal priesthood of believers, to the production of the grossest irregularities in the Christian Church. So, also, in their misconception of their spiritual kingship of Christians, they despised the powers that be, teaching that believers dare neither hold civil offices, nor obey rulers. The whole Anabaptist system, of which this error concerning the Lord's Day forms a part, is thus shown to have its origin in a gross misconception of the nature of the Gospel.

The same principle underlies Antinomianism. Both overestimate the ability of the regenerate. Both overlook that imperfection and infirmity which cleave even to those who, in this life, are most fully controlled by the Holy Ghost. Both forget that, "the old Adam, like an unruly and obstinate animal, still constitutes a portion of them, and must be forced into the obedience of Christ, not only by the teaching, admonition, urging and threatening of the law, but frequently by the rod of chastisement and affliction, until this sinful flesh is wholly put off, and man is perfectly renewed in the Resurrection." Both imagine the conditions of Heaven transferred to inhabitants of Earth, and expect Christian life to be developed in man by the Holy Ghost, so as to take possession of his whole nature,

and without any agency or co-operation of the person thus regenerated, to work in and through him the will of God. The Scriptural doctrine of human passivity in regeneration, is thus carried over into the unscriptural doctrine of human passivity in sanctification. This view of the Lord's Day is the Scylla which we must avoid; but the Charybdis is no less dangerous.

Sabbatarianism in its Scriptural Relations.

Sabbatarianism embraces many different shades of view, verging from the strictest legalism, to a form so exceedingly mild, that there is often a difficulty, in distinguishing it from Dominicalism. We must, therefore, be very careful not to ascribe to milder Sabbatarians, what can be said only of those who maintain the stricter view. All, however, agree in this, viz.: that the observance of the Lord's Day, is directly enjoined in the Third Commandment, in other words, that the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are identical institutions, or the Lord's Day is a Sabbath. In this connection, it is necessary to refer to the Scriptural claims of this position.* Our rejection of Sabbatarianism, must depend solely, upon the testimony which the Word of God has given us, concerning the ceremonial character of the Sabbath. If it can be clearly established that Ex. 31 : 17; Ez. 20 : 12, 20; Rom. 14 : 5; Gal. 4 : 5; Col. 2 : 17, refer only to a specific, and not also to a generic Sabbath, Sabbatarianism has established its position. Upon these passages, all discussion for seeking the truth, must concentrate. Other passages are to be considered only in the relation which they sustain to these. Gen. 2 : 3, proves nothing when considered by itself. Clearly as it may seem, at first sight, to refer to an institution of that ordinance, directly after the creation, its testimony is no clearer, than that of the first chapter of Genesis, which, at first sight, seems to be a connected narrative of events directly consecutive; but which the discoveries of Geology show, must have another meaning, than that which the superficial student, ignorant of the testimony of the rocks, would assign to it. God's truth is not to be torn into sentences, which are to be considered apart from each other, but is to be viewed as one connected whole, harmonious throughout. Revelation is to be interpreted by revelation; Scripture by

* See also *Evangelical Review* for January, 1869, Vol. XX. p. 136.

Scripture. The proleptical interpretation of this passage, is not an ingenious device, to sustain a pre-conceived theory, but is forced upon us by the Word of God itself.*

The hebdomonal division of time during the patriarchal age, affords no proof of a pre-Mosaic observance of the Sabbath; just as the omission of this ordinance in the records of the period between creation and the journey into Egypt, in itself considered, does not prove that the Sabbath belonged to the ceremonial law. Viewed in connection with other circumstances, the absence of any reference, adds weight to the position; but taken by itself, it amounts to nothing. Dr. J. H. Kurtz of Dorpat, in his "History of the Old Testament Covenant," (Vol. 2, p. 109, 110, Eng. Tr.,) declares: "Neither the divine determination in Gen. 2 : 3, to sanctify the seventh day, nor the peculiar form in which it is enjoined in the law, "*Remember the seventh day to keep it holy*," nor the event which prepared for the legal proclamation of the Sabbath, viz.: the fact that no manna fell upon the seventh day, can be appealed to, as yielding decisive testimony in the affirmative; but, on the other hand, we cannot quote these passages as proofs to the contrary, as Hengstenberg has done."

It seems strange, that the word "*Remember*," of the Third Commandment, is so often referred to, as affording decisive proof, that the Sabbath was previously known. It does not require much reflection, to recall instances, in which parents or teachers, in laying down new rules or principles to those in their care, have introduced the declaration, of what has hitherto been unknown, by the word "*Remember*," in order to declare the special importance of what is thus enjoined.

Scripture cannot be made to contradict itself. On this subject, as on all others, there is perfect harmony. The analogy of faith, points us to the true interpretation, "I gave them my Sabbath to be a *sign*." "It is a *sign* between me and the *children of Israel*." "Let no man judge you, in respect of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."†

* Chemnitz in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, uses these words in explaining a difficulty which some persons had found in Ex. 24 : 7 : "*Sed non animadvertunt, multa per anticipationem, seu per ὑστερον πρότερον in historia sacra dici.*"

† "The exclusively legal view, which bases the institution primarily

Sabbatarianism in its Historical Development.

A careful examination of Church History, shows us a period, in which the Sabbatarian view was unknown, and the Sabbath and the Lord's Day were considered distinct institutions.* So, also, again, when the Reformation had purified the Church, the testimony of the Protestants was unanimous on this subject. Whilst the Sabbatarian view was held by the Romish Church, Lutheranism and Calvinism concurred, in maintaining that the Sabbath was an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law, which, in Christ had been abrogated, and that the Lord's Day was to be observed, for other reasons, than that of the direct language of the Third Commandment.

Traces of Sabbatarianism in the Protestant Church, are said to have appeared first in Bohemia; but it did not assume a definite form, until the last decade of the sixteenth century. The greatest laxity in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, was prevalent, especially in England. One of the homilies of the Church of England, declares that, "God was more dishonored, and the devil better served on the Sunday, than on all the days of the week beside." Viewed by many, merely as a season of recreation and en-

and directly on the Fourth Commandment, in the first place, affords no sufficient explanation of the transfer of the Sabbath, from the seventh to the first day of the week, and secondly, is utterly irreconcilable with the clear declarations of the New Testament," Schaff's *History of the Apostolical Church*, p. 555.

See, also, some very just remarks translated from Dr. Plitt of Bonn, by Rev. J. D. Severinghaus, *Evangelical Review*, Vol. XVIII, p. 170.

* "It is well known, that in the early ages of the Church, a distinction was made between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. The former was the Jewish weekly Sabbath, i.e., the seventh day of the week. It embraced the occasional fasts and feasts proscribed by the Mosaic law; cf. Col. 2 : 16 ; Gal. 4 : 10. Such was the use of the Jewish word *σαββατον*. But the early Christians, in order to distinguish this, from the first day of the week, on which they held their religious assemblies, of worship (1 Cor. 2 : 16 ; Acts 20 : 7,) called the first day *ἡμέρα κυρίου* (Lord's Day), Rev. 1 : 10. Of this distinction, there is clear evidence in the writings of the ecclesiastical fathers. That it was early made even in Apostolic times is evident, from comparing Col. 2 : 16, with Rev. 1 : 10." Prof. Moses Stuart on Rom. XIV : 5.

joyment, it was used by them, as an occasion for rioting and crime. Pious men were shocked at the disregard and contempt of God's Word, which were thus manifested, and they began to consider how the current of ungodliness might be checked. As is so often the case, with those, whose minds revolt at a certain form of error, they rushed to the opposite extreme, and devised a doctrine, by which they hoped to resist the license hitherto prevalent. They were not dishonest; but, in their earnest desire to effect a reformation, and thus advance the cause of true religion, they were led to adopt an expedient, which, no doubt, seemed to them to be right, by which they hoped, that they would be more successful, than by the means hitherto employed. The great leader in this movement, was Dr. Nicholas Bownd, who, in 1595, published his work on the Sabbath, the great object of which, was to show the identity between that ordinance and the Lord's Day. Fearing the popular judgment, the book was first published anonymously, and it was not until after several editions had been exhausted, that the author's name appeared upon the title page. Not only in Great Britain, but, also, in Holland and Germany, the little work attracted considerable attention, and excited bitter controversy. Latent Sabbatarianism, had already imbued many minds, and the sentiments of Dr. Bownd met with a response, in the hearts of many, who, with him, had been led to regard a return to the doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject, as the only refuge. As this doctrine fell in harmoniously with their system, the Puritans, at once adopted it as their own, and endeavored to enforce it with all the Judaic strictness, which they maintained on other points. "It was not till about 1595," says Mr. Hallam,* "that they began to place it nearly on the footing of the Jewish Sabbath, interdicting, not only the slightest action of worldly business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation, a system which once promulgated, soon gained ground, as suiting their atrabilious humor, and affording a new theme of censure on the vices of the great." "In defiance, says Mr. Macau-

* Constitutional History of England, (Harper's Edition), p. 227. The quotation is made to establish a fact, and not to approve of every sentiment which it expresses.

lay,* "of the express and reiterated declarations of Luther and Calvin, they turned the weekly festival, by which the Church had from primitive times, commemorated the resurrection of her Lord, into a Jewish Sabbath." In 1625, the Puritans, who were at that time, the prevailing party in Parliament, enacted laws changing the name Sunday, wherever it occurred in the statutes, into Sabbath. "The different appellations of this festival, were, at that time, known symbols of the different parties."† "The use of the word Sabbath, instead of Sunday, became, in that age, a distinctive mark of the Puritan party."‡ The position of the Puritans was greatly strengthened by the fanaticism of James I, who, in order to check the tendency which Puritanism had assumed, made regulations concerning the Lord's Day, which entirely disregarded its sanctity. "He issued a proclamation," says Mr. Hume, "to allow and encourage after Divine service, all kinds of lawful games and exercises: and by his authority, he endeavored to give sanction to a practice, which his subjects regarded as the utmost instance of profanity and impiety." The effect of such conduct, on the part of the sovereign, was only to swell the ranks of the Sabbatarians, by the accession of many Dominicals, who were unwilling to see the Lord's Day thus profaned. In 1648, we find that Sabbatarianism had made such a gain, that it was incorporated into the Westminster Catechism, by which it has since been extensively diffused among the Calvinistic churches.

The leaven was also working elsewhere. We believe Sabbatarianism in the Lutheran Church was developed from within, rather than introduced from without. The term Sabbath, applied in a figurative sense to the Lord's Day, by some of our earlier teachers, gradually lead to a confusion of the two institutions. The treatment of the proper observance of the Lord's Day, under the Third Commandment, inasmuch as it indirectly belongs to the proper consideration of God's Word, contributed to the same end. So, also, did the study of scholastic theology, which was strongly Sabbatarian. In Gerhard we find considerable confusion. He maintains that the Sabbath was unknown to the patriarchs, but, at the same time, identifies it with the Lord's Day. From him, as we proceed down-

*Macaulay's History of England, Vol. I, Chap. I.

† Hume, Chapter L.

‡ Hallam, p. 229.

ward, the nearer we approach the era of Rationalism, the more strongly marked becomes Sabbatarianism. We pass through a long line of teachers, most of whom were confessional on every point except this. Many of the so called *dead* orthodoxes, as they were called, were exceedingly strict Sabbatarians. This should be remembered by those who are so fond of maligning our Church on account of her doctrine, concerning the Lord's Day, and who, at the same time, delight in casting upon her reproach, on account of the lives of some of these teachers, who in many things held to the letter, but wanted the true spirit of Lutheranism. Abraham Calov, the most maligned of Lutheran theologians, was a Sabbatarian. Fecht of Rostock, resisted the current. but Schwartz and Mayer were as zealous in attaching Dominicalism, as they were in persecuting Spener. Spener and all the pietists were likewise Sabbatarians. This development of Sabbatarianism on all sides, as we approach the era of Rationalism, seems strange. The teachers who gradually assumed this position, were far removed from Rationalism; nor dare we regard Rationalism, in any way, a result of Sabbatarianism. Sabbatarianism was rather a symptom, which was marking the gradual decline of the Church. The spiritless formalism of dead orthodoxy, and the intense subjectivity of Pietism, alike prepared the way for the Infidelity which followed, and were alike characterized by a departure from the faith of the Church, concerning the Lord's Day. The fact that Rationalists were not Sabbatarians, does not prove that this position is incorrect. With the adoption of Sabbatarian views, by some of our earlier teachers, a beginning was made of that sundering of the Church from the Confessions, which at last ended in so great evil. As truth is a connected whole, the weakening of a single link affects the entire chain. The teachers themselves remained orthodox, but a latitudinarian tendency gradually grew up among their pupils, who, from generation to generation, developed what their teachers had begun.

It is a grievous mistake, to apply a wrong argument, in support of a true position. The truth which we thus attempt to defend, is thereby weakened far more than the error which we attack. God's weapon for overcoming that which opposes him, is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Strongly attached, as we may be to the doctrine of the Trinity, we would do wrong to urge 1

John 5 : 7, as an argument : for scriptural as is the doctrine there inculcated, the passage is spurious, and appealing to it, is making such an addition to the words of Revelation, as the Scriptures condemn. Advocates as we may be of the true presence of the glorified body of Christ in the Holy Supper, it would be wrong for us to endeavor to convince others of the truth of our position, by an appeal to the sixth chapter of John, as no reference is there made to the sacrament of the altar, but only to spiritual communion with Christ by faith. Desirable as we may believe total abstinence to be, we dare not attempt to maintain our position, by tearing from their connection the words, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," or by contending that the wine of the New Testament could not intoxicate. Nothing is gained by handling the Word of God deceitfully. The whole counsel of God is to be declared. Nothing is to be withheld, nothing concealed, nothing added. God himself will take care of his truth. If men will pervert and abuse it, when declared, this is not our fault. We must not rush to the Lord's rescue with weapons of our own. Sabbatarianism in its origin in the Protestant Church, resembles many other attempts at Reformation, which have been made by striking at the branches, instead of at the root of error. The desecration of the Lord's Day, should not have been regarded the sin, against which the Church was to array herself. The contempt of God's Word, was the crime which should have been charged against those, who thus despised the ordinances of God's house, and the preaching of the Gospel. Regard for the day, for any other reason, than from respect of the Word, with which it is occupied, is an abomination to the Lord ; and, hence, we are to insist not so much upon the day as the Word, not so much upon the seventh portion of time, as the true spiritual Sabbath, which comprehends all time. Once lead a man to keep the true spiritual Sabbath, and you will find no difficulty, in inducing him to observe such seasons as the Church has set apart for her services, and the Lord has sealed with his marks of approval.

Sabbatarianism in its Doctrinal and Practical Relations.

Sabbatarianism, especially in its Puritanic form, is nothing else than another phase of the same tendency, which was manifested by the Judaizing teachers in the early

Christian Church. They feared the freedom of the Gospel, as they apprehended that it might degenerate into licentiousness ; and, therefore, preferred to cling to all the ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, and to require their strict observance by others. It involves the same error, as that against which the Apostle Paul so earnestly strove in the Epistle to the Galatians, such a mingling of the Law with the Gospel, such a putting of new wine into old bottles, as to render hopeless all justification either by the Old or New Dispensation. What Augustine said concerning certain Pelagian teachers of his day, has been well applied to the adherents of some of the more rigid forms of Sabbatarianism, *Dum volunt esse et Judaei et Christiani, nec Judaei nec Christiani potuerunt*. Especially is this attempt to engraft many of the ordinances of the Ceremonial law, upon the Gospel manifest in Puritanism, with its preference for the Old Testament above the New, with its conversion of the sacraments of the New Covenant, into emblematic ordinances less significative than those of the Old, with its burdening of the conscience, with a system of casuistry eminently suggestive of the exactions of those, to whom the conduct of the Saviour was an offence,* and with its merciless severity towards all those who transgressed its prescribed rule of right.

Professedly, no two systems are farther apart than Puritanism and Romanism. So far as the externals of religious worship is concerned, their position is directly opposite. But the same idea of asceticism permeates both. In Romanism, we find it, in a grosser form ; in Puritanism, in a form more refined and subtile. The rigid austerities of the Puritans, like the penances of the Papists, are founded upon the principle, that self-denial and suffering, for their own sake, without reference to any benefit, thereby conferred upon the individuals own character, or upon others, are well-pleasing to God. Asceticism thus prac-

*The following extreme case will illustrate this. Dr. Hessey quotes it from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6th, A. D., 1658 : "The said day Alexander Cairnie, in Tillioche, was delaitit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit it was of necessitie, for saving of the beast's lyfe in tyme of storme. Was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke."—Bampton Lectures for 1860, p. 217.

ticed, obscures the doctrine of Justification by faith, as it teaches, that man himself must suffer for his sins, in order to win God's favor, or prepare himself for God's grace. No one who holds this strict Sabbatarian view, actually makes the "Sabbath" his delight. The restraint which it imposes upon him, is by no means agreeable; but, he comforts himself with the thought, that suffering thus endured belongs to the design, for which God has instituted this ordinance, and, therefore, he bears the burden, esteeming it a means of grace, whereby the Lord will bestow upon him spiritual blessings.

Sabbatarianism co-incides with the idea of a separation, between the kingdoms of nature and of grace, which characterizes the whole of the Calvinistic system.* It cannot conceive of such a union of the natural and the spiritual, that the two can continually and harmoniously co-operate. It imagines a constant and inherent opposition between them. It cannot understand the principle which makes all actions, all thoughts, all time holy. Hence, the spiritual Sabbath, which makes all days in themselves alike, is an anomaly to Puritanism. Practically it denies, that the six days of labor are also holy; and whilst it does not directly teach so, yet indirectly it proclaims the doctrine, that God asks only one-seventh of our time for his service, that serving him one day in seven is honor enough, and that the remainder he permits us to use for ourselves; thus strikingly harmonizing with the periodical religion, so prevalent in some quarters.

Hence, the observance of the Sabbath which Puritanism enjoins, requires on the Lord's Day, such a separation of the soul from itself, such an absorption in divine contemplation, such "an imageless devotion bare and abstract," as is an utter impossibility under the circumstances of the present life. Prolonged ecstatic contemplation of this

* Calvin, it is true, was not a Sabbatarian, but the principles which he maintained, necessarily led to Sabbatarianism. The genius of Puritanism required, either an abandonment of the Lord's Day, or a resting of its claims upon the Third Commandment. For with the exception of Ordination, the Puritans abolished all useful church-rites, not directly enjoined by Scripture, such as Confirmation, the Church year with its festivals, sacred act in the house of God, etc. The latter alternative was, therefore, adopted, and Sabbatarianism became a characteristic feature of the Calvinistic system.

kind, can be enjoyed only in the world to come. Our religion, too, does not allow such a divorce of the concrete from the abstract. It respects man's entire nature, body, soul and spirit, in all his relations to God, to the Church, the family, the state, to himself. Its object is to pervade all the circumstances of these relations, with the life in Christ. The labor of the week thus belongs as fully to God's service, as the rest of the Lord's Day. What God has thus sanctified, we dare not call common, or unclean. "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

* *Design of the Ceremonial Sabbath.*

Against this position, the argument may be urged, that if we declare such to be the tendency of Puritanic Sabbatarianism, we must, also, make the same charge, against the Sabbath of the Old Dispensation. But, in the first place, we must recollect, that even the Jewish Sabbath did not demand such a strict observance, as that enjoined by the stricter Sabbatarians, in the Christian Church. Rabbinical tradition had imposed many exactions, in reference to this ordinance, which the Law never commanded. The design of Christ in showing, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, was to explain the true design of the Jewish Sabbath, and to remove from it all human additions, with which it had been burdened. The days of the Old Dispensation did not end, until the death of Christ had completed all the types and shadows which prefigured his office and work. Our Lord, therefore, in his active obedience undertaken for us, was subject to all the requirements of the Law, both Moral and Ceremonial. Hence, his comparative freedom in regard to the Sabbath, shows that such liberty was consistent with the strictest requirements of the Old Testament.

Yet the law of commandments contained in ordinances, even when stripped of all human additions, was still a burden—a yoke, which neither the Apostles, nor their fathers were able to bear. The best way to convince a man of his weakness, is to lead him to attempt the performance of what is beyond his power. This was one of the designs of the Ceremonial Law. Man was to be humbled, and to be taught his own helplessness, before God would interfere for his relief. In Hehthenism, we see God leaving man to devise for himself, various ways of salvation, the failure of all of which, lead to an earnest longing for redemption.

In Judaism, on the other hand, God devised and prescribed a way, in order to teach man human inability to work out righteousness, even by a way of divine appointment. After the entrance of sin, salvation by the Moral Law was hopeless. Man himself felt the necessity for another way, a way by which a satisfaction might be rendered for sin. The Ceremonial Law was therefore given. In man's original strength, it might have been fulfilled; but the weakness which followed sin, rendered this an utter impossibility. Thus was taught the necessity for still another way. Man was led to see still more of the divine plan for his rescue. He was made to feel, not only that a satisfaction for sin was necessary, and that this satisfaction must be of divine appointment, but, also, that God himself must make it. In this manner, the burden of the Law forced men to the Gospel, the Law became the school-master to lead men to Christ. Many of the regulations concerning the Sabbath, were of this character, intended in no way for those who have the fulness of the Gospel; but only for those who, through the darkness of the law, were groping to a knowledge of the way of salvation. Thus one who would conscientiously endeavor to fulfill the requirements contained in Is. 58 : 13, would soon find that in his own strength, refraining on the Sabbath, from doing his own works, or finding his own pleasure, or speaking his own words, was impossible; and would thus be led earnestly to long for that harmony, attained only through the new birth, which makes the works, the pleasure, the words, the very life of the believer one with that of his Saviour.

Why was the Ceremonial Sabbath binding upon Believers, under the Old Dispensation.

The question has been started, Why then was the seventh day Sabbath binding upon those who, under the Old Dispensation, by faith in Christ, were already enjoying the true spiritual Sabbath? This inquiry, actually includes under it another, Why was the Ceremonial Law binding upon those, who, under the Old Dispensation, had already been justified by faith in a coming Saviour? We reply: Under the Old Testament economy, the distinction between the Moral and Ceremonial Law, had not as yet been accurately defined; and the precepts of both were equally binding. Those who were justified by faith in a coming

Saviour, therefore, whilst no longer relying upon the Ceremonial Law, as a ground of righteousness, yet felt constrained to obey its precepts, for the same reasons, on account of which, believers, under the New Testament Dispensation, feel the obligation of obedience to the Moral Law. It was God's pleasure, that the fulness of the Gospel should not be enjoyed by those who lived before the coming of Christ. The deliverance which was to be provided was declared to them, but of the exact nature of this deliverance, they were ignorant. They were assured, that an atonement was to be made for their sins; but *how* this atonement was to be made, was not more than dimly revealed. The treasures of the Gospel, were the blessings, which, under the Old Dispensation, eye had not seen, nor ear heard. The manifestation of the mystery which had been hid from ages and from generations, which prophets and righteous men had desired to see and saw not, and desired to hear and heard not, which even angels had desired to look into, made the blessings of the least under the New, greater than those of the greatest under the Old Dispensation. Just as under the present economy, the consciousness of sin, to which the Moral Law bears witness, leads even those who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, to groan within themselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body; so, also, the knowledge of salvation, not yet perfected, to which the Ceremonial Law bore witness, intensified the unutterable longing of the soul for the completion of God's promises. The more heavily the burdens of Mosaic ceremonies, pressed upon them, the more ardently did they desire the coming of the Consolation of Israel. Thus with faith begotten by the Gospel contained within the Law, so weak that the Apostle accounts it as nothing, when compared with faith, which was afterwards imparted, believers were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of his father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. *

* * * Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God. Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service to them, which are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," Gal. 4 : 1—4 ; 7—10.

Finally, the tendency of Puritanic Sabbatarianism, is not only to lead its adherents to work righteousness, but also to do a positive injury to others. The austerity, with which they believe that the Lord's Day should be observed, is so strenuously insisted upon, that the idea is conveyed, that the essence of religion consists in such Sabbatizing. The practical effect of this opinion has thus been stated by Mr. Conybeare :* "The Puritans have always enforced this religious privilege of the advanced Christian, as if it had been a command compulsory on all men. And they have enforced it, moreover in its negative and prohibitory aspects; where they could, by penal laws; everywhere, by damnatory denunciations. Thousands are thus alienated from piety, by associating it from their earliest childhood, with a day of gloom and restriction, imposed upon them by arbitrary force. The child is father to the man, and a childhood thus trained too often fathers a manhood of impiety. * * * * Thus the masses are brutalized and degraded, by the attempt to raise them prematurely to a high degree of spiritual advancement."

We have seen that there is also a form of Sabbatarianism, exceedingly mild, and pervaded throughout by the spirit of Gospel liberty. This must not be confounded with Puritanic Sabbatarianism. Resting, however, upon an unscriptural and unhistorical basis, it must likewise be rejected. The Gospel freedom, by which it is characterized, is inconsistent with its position, that the Lord's Day and the Sabbath are identical institutions. Either the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, or it is not. If it be the Sabbath, all the rites and ceremonies of the Law, connected with the seventh-day rest must be observed; for the Holy Scriptures tell us nothing concerning a Christian Sabbath,

* Edinburgh Review, 1853.

or a Gospel freedom, in the observance of this ordinance. If it be not the Sabbath, but an institution, which has originated in the present Dispensation, then and then only is it free from the rigor of the Law.

Unscriptural Forms of Dominicalism.

We do not support that form of Dominicalism, which, while it rejects the idea, that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, at the same time esteems it an institution of direct Divine appointment. Those who hold this view, argue that the Apostles were divinely inspired, not only for teaching, but also for regulating the externals of worship, and, consequently, they regard the Apostolic custom of devoting the first day of the week, to the service of religious worship, in the light of a command. The divine sanction, which this Apostolic practice received on several occasions, by the presence of the risen Lord in the assemblies of the disciples, and the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, are referred to as indubitable evidences, that the Apostles were right, and that this custom *must* be adopted by all Christians. Far be it from us to derogate aught from the honor which was thus shown the day of our Lord's resurrection; but Apostolic custom in itself considered, does not make a practice obligatory upon those living in succeeding ages of the Church. The Apostles did not act in everything by Divine inspiration. Even when they did, and manifest tokens of Divine favor sanctioned their conduct, institutions thus established, were not necessarily permanent. The love feasts of the early Church, and the exact arrangement of the externals of worship, and of grades in the ministry (Eph. IV : 11), are not binding upon us. The laying on of hands by the Apostles, was followed by the gift of the Holy Ghost; yet very few Protestants esteem this ordinance as of Divine obligation. Confirmation and Ordination are practiced only as appropriate ceremonies, whereby the Church recognizes as Christians, or as ministers, those who have already received and obeyed a Divine call. The Augsburg Confession (XXVIII : 61—66), attacks this very position: "There are certain marvellous disputations touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sabbath; which all arose from the false persuasion, that there should be a service in the Church, like to the Levitical; and that Christ committed

to the Apostles and bishops, the devising new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church, when the righteousness of faith, was not plainly enough taught. Some dispute that the observance of the Lord's Day, is not indeed of the law of God, but *as it were* of the law of God; and touching holidays, they prescribe how far it is necessary to work in them. What else are such disputations but snares for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate traditions, yet the equity of them can never be perceived, so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth. * *

* * The Apostles commanded to abstain from blood, Acts 15 : 29. Who observeth that nowadays. And yet they do not sin, who observe it not. For the Apostles themselves would not burden men's consciences, with such servitude; but they forbade it for a time because of scandal." So, also, the Apology, Art. XIV : § 16. "Thus the Apostles for the sake of good discipline, ordained many things in the Church, which were altered in the course of time; but they instituted no ordinances as necessary and unalterable."

Nor does even our Lord's approval in itself considered, make a rite of perpetual obligation, John 13 : 1—12. The purely ecclesiastical phase of Dominicalism, must also be rejected, as the basis upon which it rests, is not scriptural. The power of the Church to add to the requirements of the Holy Word, new rules of faith and life, is one of the great errors, for the subversion of which, Protestantism and especially Lutheranism have striven so earnestly against Rome, Augsburg Confession, Art. XXVIII; Apology, Art. XIV; Appendix to the Smalcald Articles.

Lutheran Dominicalism.

We believe the position set forth and maintained in the Augsburg Confession, the only one tenable. The Lutheran Church considers the Lord's Day a distinct institution, from the Sabbath of the Third Commandment, and observes it, not from any requirement arising from Apostolic practice, or ecclesiastical law; but solely from other considerations, to which allusion has been made in a previous page of this article. She exalts the Word above the Day, considering the Lord's Day holier than other days only, on account of the Word of God, with which it is occupied—holier, because the Word of God, whereby it is

sanctified, is the source of all the holiness which the other days possess. If any one enjoys the true Christian Sabbath, *i. e.*, the rest of the soul in God, it is because his life has become pervaded by the great truths, which the Lord's Day commemorates. Sunday, dear to her on account of her Lord's resurrection, becomes still dearer, from the fact, that the Lord himself blessed it, with special marks of his favor, and that the good and holy of all succeeding ages of the Church, have devoted it, to united prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

Objection to Lutheran Dominicalism. Disregard of the Lord's Day in Germany.

But the argument has been urged against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Day, that Sunday will not be observed, if we remove from it, the idea of legal obligation. Sincere and well-meaning men have made the same plea against the doctrine of Justification by faith, asserting, that if a righteousness independent of the deeds of the law were proclaimed, good works would not be performed. Thus, Gerhard, in his *Confessio Catholica* narrates, that when the Romish Bishop of Windsor was dying, and another bishop present reminded him, that justification was to be obtained alone through the blood of Christ, the dying man replied, that it was dangerous to open this doctrine to the people, but that it was safe to declare and explain it, to him and those placed in like circumstances.

We are pointed to the manner, in which the Lord's Day is observed on the continent of Europe, as an evidence of the tendency of the doctrine which bases the observance of this institution, upon any other ground, than that of the Third Commandment. But unfortunately for the position thus assumed, Roman Catholic Europe, notwithstanding the Sabbatarian position of the Romish Church, shows far more laxity in the observance of the Lord's Day, than do the States which are under Lutheran control. Paris and Rome stand pre-eminent for the disregard which they pay the Lord's Day. "In Spain and Portugal," it is said, "multitudes rush on Sunday from the Confessional to the bull-fight." The Reformed cities are little better, as may be seen from the following description of a Sunday in Geneva.* "A pleasure-tour in the steamboats, which are

* Quoted by Dr. Hessey, from Laing's Notes of a Traveller, London, 1842.

regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade round the lake; a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing congregations in the evening, at the theatre, the equestrian circus, the concert-saloons, ball-rooms and coffee-houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday. In the village churches, along the Protestant side of Geneva, the rattling of billiard-balls, the rumbling of the skittle trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle-gun club, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of state-prescribed prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations, in fact, to a few females, and a dozen or two old men, in populous parishes, supplied with able and zealous ministers." The looseness, in regard to the proper observance of this institution, then, cannot be the teaching of the Lutheran Church, concerning the abrogation of the Sabbath. It has its origin, not in any particular view, concerning the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, but in the general breaking up of morals, consequent upon wide-spread infidelity. We find it, in the same disregard of God's word, and the preaching of the Gospel, which we have before seen to have originated the Anabaptist view concerning the Lord's Day. Rationalism had infused itself into all churches; even those who most strenuously resisted it, by constant contact, unconsciously to themselves, gradually partook of the infection. A denial, or a weakness of conception concerning the reality and power of practical religion followed, which manifested itself in this external development. Thus Sabbatarianism, originally devised in order to check the improper observance of the Lord's Day, and becoming more and more decided, as we advance towards the era of Rationalism, utterly failed of its object. A resort to means not clearly of Divine choosing, will never further a good end. As might be expected, with the decline of Rationalism in Europe, and the return of the Church to the religion of our fathers, the Lord's Day is more properly observed.

Does Lutheran Dominicalism make man wiser than God.

Some who have examined the Lutheran doctrine of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, find a difficulty, in the fact, that whilst our Church affirms, that the Sabbath has been abrogated, she at the same time teaches the importance of a fixed season of rest and worship. "If the Lord's Day

have no foundation in a direct positive command," say, they, "you arrogate to yourselves, wisdom and power superior to that of God, by maintaining that any day has claims to a peculiar observance." Such a mode of reasoning proves too much, and, therefore, proves absolutely nothing. With equal propriety, it might be employed against family worship, against stated seasons for private devotion, against the assembling of congregations in church edifices, against infant baptism, against the admission of female members of the Church to the Lord's table, in fact, against any institution, or rite, or custom, or rule, not directly and specifically commanded in the Holy Word. No difference how necessary a rule may be to the fulfilment of a general principle which God has enjoined upon us, if such rule be not particularized in express words, consistency with the line of reasoning, employed in this objection, would compel us to deny its importance.* The regulation of the minutiae of Divine worship, belonged to the Ceremonial Law. In the Gospel, God lays down certain principles, but does not enjoin the details, except where the foresight and sanctified experience of the Church, cannot reach the case. Under all other circumstances, the commandment connected with the injunction of the principle, is simply, Let all things be done decently and in order. In the case under consideration, the general command given, is, to worship God, not to neglect the assembling of ourselves together, to participate in united public prayer, to preach the word, to hear the word, to administer and receive the holy sacraments. To accomplish these ends, the Church, in her Christian liberty, must set apart some time. The Lord's Day she has chosen. All objections urged against the selection of Sunday, must apply also to any other day which could have been designated, whether it had been every seventh, or every fifth, or every second, or every tenth day, or every seventh hour, or seventh week. There must be some specific application of the

* Quando disputatur de iis quae habent testimonium in verbo Dei, intelligenda esse non illa tantum, quae totidem literis et syllabis in Scriptura extant, sed illa etiam, quae ex certa et manifesta Scripturae sententia, bona consequentia deducantur. Et si talia intelligerent mandata, nulla esset controversia; sunt enim non minus divina mandata, quam quae totidem literis et syllabis in Scriptura exprimentur.—Chemnitz, Ex. Con. Tri., De Bonis Operibus.

• general principle involved in these commands: and every one which could be made, is alike subject to this charge. If the adherents of the Lutheran doctrine concerning the Lord's Day, arrogate to themselves a wisdom superior to God, by esteeming as useful and important, and, therefore, weekly observing what he has not directly enjoined; so, also, do all Christians who make use of any other prayer, than the formula which the Lord himself has given. But the Lutheran doctrine does not make man wiser than God. On the contrary, the wisdom of God is exhibited, in not burdening the Church with irksome details of ceremonies, but in leaving to Christian liberty, the devising and observance of such externals of worship, as administer to the growth of the spiritual man. Neither is the Church inconsistent in assigning to many of the details of worship, which, in the exercise of this liberty, she has adopted, a rank above mere *adiaphora*. "For, although such customs, are by their nature left free, in so far as God has neither enjoined nor prohibited them, yet they become necessary, each in its kind, not as if necessary to salvation, but for the purpose of maintaining order."*

Relation of the Doctrine of the Lord's Day, to the Lutheran System.

The difference between Lutheranism and other systems of doctrine, popularly styled evangelical, does not consist in a divergence on a few unimportant points, but in tendencies of vast and far-reaching importance. Our Confessors adhering closely to the Gospel, never conceded that our Church was only one denomination among many others, a sort of *primus inter pares*; but emphatically affirming in the conclusion of the Augsburg Confession, that they received nothing contrary to Scripture, or to the Catholic Church, thus declared for all time, that, so far as others differed from the Augsburg Confession, just so far was their teaching unscriptural, and they themselves outside of the true Catholic Church. Whilst in every communion which confesses and teaches the doctrines of the three oecumenical creeds, there are many true Christians, yet our Confessors thus affirm that there is no church evangelical in the full sense of the term, but the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and that they only belong to this

* Hutter's Compend, p. 159.

Church, who "hold nothing contrary to" "those things which have been enumerated," in the Confession.* What they thus declared, has, in all succeeding ages, borne the test of that sole and infallible rule, by which all tenets must be tried, and all doctrines and teachers judged. Consequently, when we proceed from a consideration of other systems of faith, to that which is found in our Confessions, we find the latter characterized by a consistency, to which the former are strangers. Like Scripture; it is full of mystery, it contains many seeming paradoxes; but like Scripture; it is also free from all contradictions. One with Scripture; in it and in it alone, we find a beautiful symmetry, "the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." Thus the Lutheran or Scriptural (for we believe these two terms to be convertible) doctrine of the Lord's Day, is in striking harmony with the doctrines of the Church, on other articles of faith. Compare it; for example, with the doctrine concerning the ministry. Just as the Lutheran Church teaches, that the true Christian Sabbath comprehends all the days of the believer's life, so, also, she has always firmly maintained the universal priesthood of believers, rejecting the idea, that, under the present dispensation, any ecclesiastical power has been conferred upon a special order of men, apart from what has been conferred upon the entire Church. But, inasmuch as confusion would be produced, if every member would attempt to exercise all the functions which belong to him as an individual Christian, and as the prosperity of the Church is materially advanced by having certain persons who concentrate their time and energies upon the ministry of the Word, the Church, in the exercise of her Christian liberty, following Apostolic custom divinely sanctioned, selects from her number, bishops or pastors, to whom; as to her representatives, she delegates the use of certain functions, which belong to the Church as a whole; just as the Church, in the exercise of the same Christian liberty, in like manner, following Apostolic custom divinely sanctioned, selects, from the Christian Sabbath, a fixed day of the week, which she devotes to a service, not more holy in itself considered, but

* See conclusion of Augsburg Confession, § 5.

more holy in virtue of the relation which it sustains to that which sanctifies all days.

So, also, the Lutheran Church has always contended for the Scriptural doctrine of the parity of all ministers; whilst at the same time, for the sake of good order, she has recognized the practical necessity for a certain conventional priority, by which some are designated as *primi inter pares*.

The New Testament doctrine of holy places is similar. God no longer confines his worship to a particular locality. Neither at Jerusalem, nor on Mount Gerizim, is the only consecrated shrine; but in every place, incense may be offered to his name, and a pure offering. Yet for order's sake, certain places must be designated, where those who worship the Father, may worship Him in Spirit and truth, through the holy ordinances of his house. He who refuses to observe the Lord's Day, because all time is to the Christian alike holy, holds a position in every way as untenable, as that of one who would neglect to attend public service, upon the ground that every place is holy.

Whilst, therefore, there is no identity, there is yet an analogy, between the ceremonies of the Old Testament, and those observed by Christians under the New. The Lord's Day corresponds to the Sabbath, the Easter season to that of the Passover, Whitsunday to Pentecost, the Christian ministry to the Jewish priesthood, and the Christian house of worship, to the Jewish temple.

Martensen remarks: "The Reformed Church, although vigorously protesting against the legal Church of Rome, is nevertheless infected with the legal spirit; whereas the germ of the fulness of the Gospel is found in Lutheranism." In no place is this more prominent, than in the doctrine concerning the Lord's Day. Whilst Antinomianism imagines sanctification complete with justification, and, hence, rushes into licentiousness, denying the co-operation of the believer with the Holy Spirit, in the development of personal holiness; and whilst the tendency of Puritanism, is to teach that justification is not complete in the present life, and that, therefore, notwithstanding the believer's reception into grace, there still remains such an antagonism between him and God, as to conflict with the idea of a perfect reconciliation, until not only the guilt, but also all the infection of sin, be removed: the Lutheran Church, on the other hand, acknowledges that believers

are not perfectly and entirely renewed in this world, and, hence, need the law as a rule of life; but, on the other hand, regards all Christians, entirely removed from the curse and condemnation of the Law, and for Christ's sake, as perfectly reconciled to God, as if they had never sinned. "Thus," says the Form of Concord, "they are never without Law, and yet they are not *under* but *in the law*, living and walking in the law of the Lord, and yet performing nothing through constraint of the law." Hence, in the New Testament Church, we find a simplicity of faith, an ardor of love, a cheerfulness of obedience, instead of the fear and bondage and gloom of the Old Dispensation. This accounts for the joyous spirit of Lutheranism. Firmly relying upon the assurance that, As far as the East is from the West, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us, and transported with delight in the consciousness of the love of Him whose favor is better than life, all her services and all her utterances are pervaded by such a spirit of joy and freedom, as have made her a wonder to many, who have not clearly apprehended the nature of the righteousness which is by faith. Hence, to her, the Lord's Day is not a day of gloomy constraint, a season in which a man is to afflict his soul. Such a celebration of Sunday, she would condemn, as did Jerome: "Fasting may be excusable on the Sabbath, but to fast on the Lord's Day, is a grave scandal." To her the Lord's Day, is a day of rejoicing, as it is a period, on which freed from the restraint of the week, she commemorates the most joyful events in her history, those which center around her Lord's giving "himself for her, in order to present her to himself, a glorious Church not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." It tells her of the victory, which for her he won. It marks the triumph which he celebrated over her conquered foes, when having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly.

"My Saviour's face made there to shine,
His rising did thee raise.
This made thee heavenly and divine,
Above the common days."

ARTICLE III.

COMMUNION WITH GOD.*

By J. FEW SMITH, D. D., NEWARK, N. J.

The theme on which I propose to address you, is a very personal one, and, as I think, of great practical importance. You need not be counselled by me, with reference to your studies, and modes of pursuing them. Nor is it fitting, that I should now speak to you of the nature of that ministry, towards which you are looking; of the qualifications for it, the demands of this wakeful and intelligent and active age upon it, and the best method of gaining for it the largest and most enduring success.

And yet, perhaps, that of which I speak will be found to be intimately related to all these.

My theme is *Personal Communion with God*.

History, or tradition, has preserved for us the saying of the Athenian Solon, KNOW THYSELF, as one of the sentences of wisdom. He who attempts to heed this counsel in the spirit of it, will, indeed, have a life-long study; but will find himself gaining not only knowledge of himself, to make him humble, and vigilant, and self-restrained, but, also, an acquaintance with mankind at large, that may endow him with a mighty power over them. He who knows himself, knows his fellowmen, and should be filled with widest charity towards them; knows what men are, and what they need, and how to touch the springs that move them. There is an acquaintance with men, that is to be acquired only by mingling with them, a practical understanding and power, which come only by participation in the affairs of practical life. Society, the wide world with its multiform interests, and exhibitions of humanity, is a school for the study of human nature, of whose enlarging, sharpening, polishing education, we should all wisely avail ourselves. But to realize its full value, we need to carry with us habits of reflection and self-study. We may see

* An Address to a company of Theological students.

vastly more of the world, than did Homer's famous man, who

"Wandering from clime to clime, observant strayed,
Their manners noted, and their states surveyed,"

and yet be ignorant of many of the profound things of human nature. The quiet, honest, self-investigation, shows what man is. History, the observation of the outer life, is understood by help of the light within.

But there is a higher maxim than that of the Greek philosopher, higher, because, divine: KNOW GOD. And this includes the other; implies, necessitates it.

This does not mean, of course, the full comprehension and measurement of God. In this sense, no man can know Him. But it is among the grandest of all our privileges and prerogatives, that we may so know Him, as to have springing in our hearts, along with profoundest reverence, the feeling of confidence in Him, and the personal appropriation of Him as our friend: know Him, not as you know the geography of your country, or the map of mental science, or a complete theological system, but as you know the wisdom and excellence of a person towards whom your heart turns, and in personal relation to whom you find a constant source of richest strength and gladness: know Him as you know a human person, yet with infinitely richer heights and depths of admiration, and trust, and love. You know no human being perfectly. Judge him however correctly, understand him however thoroughly, love him however deeply, there are depths in him you can never penetrate, there are riches of love and of moral beauty, there are powers of affection, capacities for emotion and for action, utterly immeasurable by us. Still more must this be true of Him, who concentrates in Himself all of good, and of power found in man, made by Him in His own image, and infinitely transcends it all. And yet, as your heart goes out towards your human friend, and you know him as yours, so may you know God. And as daily communion with your friend discloses characteristics which deepen your attachment to him, or just of itself, without new disclosures, by the subtle and sweet influence of his presence keeps fresh the glow of friendship, so does daily Communion with God, give us fresh insight into His beauties, and the grandeur of His Excellence, and bring upon us an influence, that deepens and

elevates our reverent affection. We are increased in the knowledge of God.

Paley says: "It is an immense conclusion, that there is a God; a perceiving, intelligent, designing Being; at the head of creation, and from whose will it proceeded." It is a great thing to know that *there is a God*. It is a greater thing to *know God*, and to walk with Him.

It will be your business as theologians, to make yourselves acquainted with the character and will of God, as you may learn them from His inspired Word, and from His works. But what I now commend to you is *Personal Communion* with Him, not as theologians, but as men; knowing God as distinguished from knowing about Him.

This, of course, implies habits of private prayer, and of meditation on God's Word, not with any specific end in view, other than simply to ascertain its meaning, and take in its full influence on your souls. Just here, I think, we all need to be guarded. We are too much in the habit of reading the Bible, for the purpose of establishing our positions; or to get texts or themes for preaching; and not enough in the simple attitude of grateful and reverent listeners to God. We must have hours when we divest ourselves of all official character, or professional and specific ends, and read not for a critical, but for a devotional exercise, not as exegetes, or theologians, or preachers, but as human beings, fallen in sin, blessed by the grace of God in the Redemption by Jesus, listening reverently to hear what God will say, counting it all joy, thus to be brought into Communion with Him.

And so as to *prayer*, in which we talk to God, and our hearts go out actively to Him, the thoughts awakened by His Word, putting themselves in responsive motion towards Him whom we love. The public prayer of an assembly, the social prayer of the smaller meeting, the family prayer,—each is good and indispensable. May the time never come in this Seminary, when the social prayer meeting shall fail to be universally attended, and earnestly sustained. But nothing can be a substitute for *private prayer*. We must have times when we are alone with God. We who are specifically students of religion, need those times as much as the busy men of the world. Our dangers are not the same as theirs; but they may be as great. Certainly his spiritual life cannot be healthy and vigorous, who does not maintain this *personal Communion with God*.

For the best understanding of God's Word, such communion is requisite. He will enter most deeply and surely into the mind of the Spirit, who thus sits with the Spirit, and learns of Him. He who lovingly seeks God, will be in the most favorable state to take the meaning of the Word without prejudice into his soul. He who humbly asks God to be his teacher, will receive guidance; and will also be best fitted and disposed to search for himself into the deep things of God, and to pass on from the milk that nourishes beginners, to the strong meat that gives vigor to the mature man. In this sense, not in any idle or mystic sense, the old saying, *Bene orasse est bene studuisse*, is true and valuable. The prayer *helps* the study, but does not take the place of it. Light shines upon the *student's* path, not upon the idler's.

For strength of personal character, such communion affords best hope. He whose soul is nourished at such sources, is strong in a spiritual might. Jacob's strength grew as he wrestled with the angel. So all the muscles and sinews of the soul are hardened, more compactly knit, by such Communion with God. Under its vitalizing influence, Christian graces are developed into rich fruitage; as the clusters of the vine are mellowed and enlarged by the genial rays reflected from the sheltering wall. He who walks with God, is less likely to be troubled with intrusive doubts, or strong allurements. Foulness shrinks from purity. The evil comes not where the good is. Or, if the devil does intrude himself even into sacred precincts, his whispers are answered by the word of Power, that springs instinct with life to the lip. It is in such seasons of solitary and devout Communion with God, that we get a deeper insight into our own defects and characteristics, and gather strength to meet the temptations that assail us. They weave mystic cords that bind our souls to him, and keep us from drifting away into self-indulgence, falling in with the spirit of men, who disregard God, and live for time. How much we need such heavenly helps and restraints, every year of thoughtless life but more clearly proves: while it is a blessed experience, that assures us, these are found in such intercourse with God. Enoch was able to walk untainted, amid the godlessness sensuality that surrounded him, because he walked and with God.

And, then, *this is among the supremest sources of moral power.*

There is a mighty assimilating power in Communion with God. We grow like that we love: like that, also, with which we familiarly associate. Constant beholding of the Lord's glory in a devout spirit, changes us into his image. There is a stamp upon the character of the man who keeps up this Communion with Jehovah, which attracts attention—an influence going from him, that makes itself felt. Moses' face, you remember, shone as he came forth from the sacred audience. The once familiar, but now neglected verses of Cowper, express, perhaps extravagantly, an all important truth:

"When one that holds communion with the skies,
Has filled his urn where these pure waters rise,
And once more mingles with us meaner things,
'Tis e'en as if an angel shook his wings;
Immortal fragrance fills the circuit wide
That tells us whence his treasures are supplied."

And thus our souls quickened, strengthened by the life ever flowing in them—that life, of which St. Paul said, "Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"—we are both *fitted* for the activities of the Christian service, and *impelled* to them.

Now you will not misunderstand me, either as counselling a habit of inactive mysticism, or as confining Communion with God, to hours of prayer and retired meditation. I confess to an admiration of many of those old mystics, whose story forms one of the most painful and most interesting chapters in human experience; bringing to us glimpses of rare beauty, touches of divine sweetness, in the midst of sad extravagance and insane weakness. We are not to go to them for teachers or for models. And yet it might be well, if the bustling, talking, organizing, out-of-doors piety of the present day, would catch some of the sweet self-abnegation, and devout trust, and holy charity, of some of the best of them; only avoiding their grand error of attempting to think God down into their hearts, instead of striving to rise to God by the ladder which He himself let down from heaven for us—the Word: the Word Incarnate, and the Word written. Communion with God, is not idle reverie, or mystic rapture—an hour wasted in contemplation, however ecstatic, that

does not mould or fructify the spiritual life. It implies the active exercise of our own powers, in thought upon God's Word, and in prayer. Even in the physical world, where there is no voluntary action, yet in all that exhibits life and fruitfulness, there is responsive, or coöperative movement. There is something in the seed, that responds to the chemical and other forces, that act upon it from without. The grape, that becomes lucious under the sun's touch, swells from within towards his attraction. The waiting upon the Lord, that renews the strength, is a wakeful, attentive waiting, not laying out the soul before God, as Gideon laid out his fleece upon the rock, for the dew to come upon it. David said, "My soul thirsteth for God," but he did not mean thereby, that he would not try to slake that thirst, by himself drawing water from the well of salvation.

It is related of Arch-Bishop Leighton, that once walking with a friend through his spacious library, when his friend expressed a warm admiration of the goodly collection of noble works, he said, "One holy thought is worth more than all of them." He surely did not mean to interdict study, the diligent use of all the instrumentalities, by which we become acquainted with God, and with ourselves, and acquire power to serve Him usefully among men. The holy thought comes in the active use of our intellectual and spiritual powers.

Prayer is an intelligent and honest opening of the soul to God. And meditation implies active thought. You may be far from personal Communion with God, even when you seem to be alone with Him. Your thoughts, that should be concentrated on Him, may be wandering; or you may waste in idle reverie, what should be intelligent action of the soul praising Him, and learning of Him. There is reason to fear, that much "private devotion," is listless, and, therefore, fruitless; reverie, rather than communion.

An art-student once said, to a great painter, "Pray, sir, may I ask what you mix your colors with?" "With *brains*, sir," was the gruff reply. There is more than one suggestion in this reply. But I may ask, do not some men seem to think, that in prayer, in so-called devotional exercises, their *brains* are not needed? That they may come empty

before God? There is no communion without thoughtfulness; and that implies themes of thought and thinking.

And so I would not confine this communion to the hours of private prayer and meditation. It belongs to action also: to Joshua on the battle-field, as well as to Moses with Aaron and Hur; to the lecture, or recitation room, as well as the closet; to the work of the mission, and the stir of society, as well as to the special visit to the mercy seat, or the sweet hour of sitting at Jesus' feet, or of gazing on the cross, or into the opened heaven. In its truest form, it pervades the whole life. It is the life. We ought to be all the time in such Communion with God, that whether we think of Him or not, there shall be an instinctive guiding of our souls in sympathy with Him; there shall be a prompt reference to Him on all occasions of questioning and perplexity, a natural appeal to Him in every moment of need. But in order to do this, there must be seasons of specific private devotion, in which this union with the Lord may be strengthened. And we may greatly fear, that the man who attempts to live without such seasons of prayer, on the ground, that in the liberty of Christ, loving is praying, and working is worship, will forget to pray, and find himself sadly separate from the source of life, his work often unwholesome, and his liberty degenerating into self-indulgence.

The drift, then, of these remarks, brethren, is to urge on you, the cultivation of *Personal Communion with God*. I affectionately and earnestly counsel you to make a heart-work of it. Shut up, as you are, in the sacred retirement here devoted to religious studies, you have doubtless, already learned, that you are not beyond the reach of temptation, or free from moral imperfections, for whose removal you need to strive. Though the grosser forms of the sin which clings to human nature, may not seem likely to trouble you, you are not inaccessible to the ambitions and rivalries, the slothfulness and negligence, the formality and self-righteousness, that often trouble even good men. You may be in danger of turning all your studies into an intellectual curriculum, and giving to your pursuits a merely professional character. And, that you may be guarded against these errors, may form the highest Christian character, may extract the richest sweets from the glorious fields here spread before you, and hive them for the future, I counsel you to keep carefully the hours of retire-

ment, of private Communion with God, on which none, not even your bosom friend, must be allowed to intrude. Of course, these are not to interfere with your studies, which are your great work, the thing for which you are here; nor will they detract from your social services. On the contrary, they will help you in these; help you in your studies, and cause you to enrich every social service, and to be most blessedly helpers of each other, and to bear a useful part in the activities of Christian benevolence and evangelization.

And it is, when I think of the future, that is before you, that I am most anxious that you should form these sacred habits, and be most fully established in them; that you should go forth into the great field of action, linked by living bonds to our living Lord, ever walking with Him, and because walking with Him, working most efficiently among men. Not less of study, or less of work, because of prayer, but study and work all the deeper, richer, more productive.

The age in which we live, is far from being mystical, or even meditative. It is a profoundly awakened and active age. The ministry, that we would send out to it, must not be idle dreamers; nor must they be men of mere professional routine, or intellectual athletics, or literary men. They must not waste their strength in sickly sentimentalism, or devote to the fashioning of vestments, and the fringes of ceremonies, powers that may be employed in sounding the Gospel on dying ears, and raising fallen humanity heavenward. It is eminently a working age: an age of action; of quick growth and changes; of great inquiry and disputation; an age, perhaps, exposed to the dangers of superficiality, of mistaking the glow of external working, for a true spiritual life; when, possibly, the religious life of many, consists more in excitement and doing than in humble communing with God; and an age, which, as just intimated, might be profited by an infusion of the old mystic, or contemplative spirit, and which is in danger of becoming shallow, because of running to the opposite extreme—and yet a noble age! in which there is larger benevolence, wider reach of knowledge, truer science, more universal information, higher civilization, grander activity of thought, more glorious liberty, than the world has ever before seen; in which, while there is, perhaps, a subtler form, if not an open avowal of hostility to Christianity, there is a nobler array of champions, with

grander equipments for defense and conquest, and undoubtedly as fine specimens of earnest, devout, spiritual, Christ-like Christians, as have ever been known. And we would have our young men go forth to the Christian ministry, at such a time, fitted for action; not to be recluses, perfunctory officials, ceremonious priests, but awake to every danger, ready for every duty, working men in a busy world, where the enemy is ever busily at work.

And because we would have you such men, best fitted to do the work, to which you will be called; to cope with difficulties, to preach the truth in Jesus, wise to win souls, wise master-builders in the Church of Christ, we would have you cultivate earnestly *Personal Communion with God*. Let this be the heart of your life; the fountain of your strength. Let its current pervade all your thoughts and doings. Be assured, you will find this for your comfort, for your preservation, for your enlightening, for your sanctifying. And it will be the central, vital force of a truly useful ministry. Not abating, in the least, external activity, it will guard that from error and superficialness. Not allowed to be a substitute for study, it will deepen your knowledge of sacred things, and enrich all your thoughts. Not putting any obstacle in the way of finest culture, or most diligent parochial organizing, it will give you a power in the pulpit, and a commanding influence in your intercourse with men, more to be desired than popular applause, or literary fame. Be assured, that the man who thus habitually communes with God, carries with him a power, for which shining talents can be no substitute, which ennobles talent, dignifying and enlarging its potency, and secures truest success.

I plead for this Communion with God, habitual, going with you always, and in everything. But, I assure you, that for its highest culture, the securing and right using of the hour of private devotion are essential. Surely, we cannot preserve this life of God in our souls, in the midst of the excitements around us, if it be not nourished by private interviews with Him. We may be alone with God in the midst of a crowd, and may pray in our hearts, while our hands are very busy. But, in order to do this, we must at times be truly alone with Him, virtually, if not literally *closeted* with Him. Thus only can we learn to walk habitually with Him, with hearts open to the least intimation of His will, with serene confidence, with alac-

rity of obedience, in the Master's spirit coming up to the work of our "*hour*," that the Father may be glorified in us. Forth from such seasons of holy communion we shall come rejoicing to run our race, and shall take up our allotted work and do it; even as Jesus, coming down from the Mount of Glory, found the demoniac waiting to be healed, and did the work, which his apostles were impotent to perform.

I might readily, young gentlemen, enforce these remarks, by the recorded experience of devout, and eminently useful men. But I need not do this. How can any of us doubt our need of these seasons of retirement to Communion with God, for the peace and refreshing of our souls, and for our preparation for the work given us to do, when we remember how often Jesus, *Immanuel*, went apart, by himself to pray; and how every special act, whether of miracle, or of teaching, or of suffering, was preceded by such a sacred solitude, a hallowed hour of Communion with the Father.

ARTICLE IV.

ECCLESIASTICAL PURITY,

By Rev. H. L. Dox, St. Gasport, N. Y.

Should a minister of the Gospel, guilty of drunkenness, adultery, or other like offences, be continued in, or, if for such conduct, once deprived of, should he ever again be restored to the functions of the sacred office? Are ecclesiastical bodies at liberty to endorse, or re-endorse such men as ministers, and can it ever be consistent or safe for churches to receive and confide in them as Pastors?

Professional apostacies have become alarmingly frequent, and it is not likely, that their frequency will lessen. Neither in the Church, nor out of it, is self-denying morality a characteristic of any age. We are too ambitious of great results, to be very careful about nice distinctions; and our progress is too rapid to justify even the hope of

scrupulous attention to purity. Indeed, increasing laxity has always been a law of human society. Numerous have been the instances of associational degeneracy. Individuals may reform; organizations, as such, never. Better rules may be adopted, and particular rules may be better enforced; but no system of social regulations has been devised, or if devised, has never yet been so reduced to practice, as to prevent deterioration. Liberty is the watch word, which, with many, means licentiousness. Restriction provokes rebellion; toleration affords "occasion to the flesh." Accordingly, as the morality of the profession is liable to the same general influences which regulate society at large, from the nature of things, as ministers multiply, apostacies will multiply.

Not a few of the reckless are yet covetous of the advantages of the holy calling. Some may have made choice of it from honorable motives, but become too corrupt to be controlled by them. Doubtless, in other cases, superficial apprehensions have been succeeded by sorrowful disappointments. Men have entered the ministry with expectations which have not been realized, and, as a consequence, they have practically ignored its obligations. They cling to it as a livelihood, not with a view to usefulness. The safe-guards of purity are thus removed; temptations increase; ambition, appetite, lust, and it may be, want, clamor; and it only remains for the strength of a particular passion, or the weakness of a particular point of character, to determine into what vice they are to fall. Every such instance, whether the result originally of weakness or wickedness, becomes the occasion of danger and of discredit to the cause of Christ.

The subject, accordingly, is neither uninteresting nor unimportant. Apostacies will occur, and the question, how they are to be treated, cannot be avoided. Nor should we leave the decision of this question, to be influenced by individual instances. We must have rules even for emergencies, and such rules should be established under circumstances most favorable to calmness and impartiality.

Not with the obstinacy of conceit, but with the firmness of an honest conviction, it is proposed in the present article, to maintain, *that any minister, who by crime or vice, once dishonors the sacred office, should be forever excluded from it.*

Let the proposition be understood. By *crime* and *vice*, are meant, not *venial*, but scandalous offences; such offences as have been named. Discrimination here is indispensable. If *perfection* is to be the professional standard, all must be excluded; or rather, none would be admitted. If no regard is had to morality, the foundations of the profession are at once subverted. Theoretically to draw the line between *venial* and *scandalous* offences, may be impracticable; to overlook, or ignore the distinction, is impossible. We must, therefore, "hold fast the golden mean." "We have this treasure in earthen," frail, imperfect, but not in vile or corrupted, "vessels." Foibles, indiscretions, eccentricities, should be treated with forbearance, while crime and vice must not be tolerated. In his "folly," Paul invoked the church to "bear" with him; but the anticipated result of not keeping his "body under," was to become a "cast away."

The objections, which may be presumed to lie against the position taken, will first be examined, and then the arguments, by which it is supposed to be sustained, will be stated.

Is it at war with the doctrine of *Forgiveness*? If so, the proposition must be abandoned. The idea of forgiveness is fundamental, or Christianity has no foundation. Nor can we innocently overlook, or practically neglect this duty, whatever may be the combination of circumstances, or the pressure of necessity. Nothing may lessen its scope, or dispute its sway. The errors and evils of depraved human nature, can scarcely transcend the imperative exercise of this divine virtue. Not only "until seven times," but "until seventy times seven," must we willingly, hopefully, joyously, receive the returning penitent to our embrace. And let it be remembered, that the most flagitious offenders may sincerely repent, and find the favor of God. Accordingly, the Church must receive such, and cordially extend to them its privileges. So far at least, all is clear.

But distinctions must be made, where there are differences. To forgive a penitent, is one thing; to elevate him to the highest seat in the synagogue, is another. And the difference between the two things, is so radical and so broad, that the instructions respecting the one, can have no necessary application to the other. The Church may become satisfied, that a fallen pastor has heartily repented:

of his sins; but *can* she be satisfied, that his penitence will patch up his ruined reputation? She may, and she should receive him within the fold; she should charitably watch over and encourage him; but is she bound, or is she at liberty, to put him on the "watch tower;" to give him the most public and most responsible station, and leader of the flock? Because we forgive him for the past, must we trust him for the future? Relinquishing the imputation of guilt, must we restore him to forfeited honors and privileges? May not a creditor generously cancel his claims against a delinquent debtor, without placing himself under obligation to become his creditor a second time? A treacherous general, from patriotic motives, may return to the deserted flag of his country; and, with the strictest propriety, he may be sent to the ranks, but it would be a little short of madness to entrust him a second time with the command. And if he is a true soldier, and a true penitent, he will give proof of sincerity, in the humblest sphere, and feel that he has been honored beyond his deserts.

The case then stands thus: We are bound to forgive: but forgiveness does not imply restoration; hence, as a consequence of forgiveness, the Church is under no obligations to restore a dishonored minister to the functions of the sacred office.

Are there any *Scriptural examples* in conflict with this conclusion? The case of David is naturally suggested, though entirely irrelevant. It is true, he was declared to be a man after "God's own heart," the highest commendation mortal ever received. And, it is true, he was sacredly anointed as the divinely appointed ruler of the Lord's chosen people. He fell; fell into the most revolting wickedness. His name was black with guilt, and his hands were red with innocent blood. His sin was very aggravating and very public, yet it was "put away," and evidently with God's approval, he continued to exercise the functions of his high office. But what of it? What has all this to do with the question, whether a fallen, but penitent minister shall continue to be a pastor? David was a king, invested with the sceptre; he was not a priest, waiting at the altar. The successful administration of the government, depended more upon his authority, than upon his reputation; less upon his moral purity, than upon his military power. During that age, at least one of the

crimes he committed, was a matter of connivance because it was so common; and even the other occurred too frequently, to cause much public excitement, especially when the criminal was a powerful sovereign, and the victim an obscure subject. Only Nathan saw the enormity of David's sin; the people were not much disturbed by it. Now, because the royal penitent, though guilty of adultery and murder, was permitted to hold his throne, and to exercise his power, does it follow, that an ambassador of Christ, whose only influence for good depends upon his purity, after indulging in scandalous wickedness, may be allowed to minister in "holy things?" Since God yielded to the wishes of the children of Israel, and granted them a king, civil power and moral purity have seldom been associated in the character of an earthly sovereign. The mightiest monarchs have not unfrequently been the worst of men. But it will be a dark day to Christianity, when the Church ceases to regard the inspired admonition, "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord."

The example of Peter, is doubtless the most pertinent. His sins belonged to the class mentioned, and after committing them, he was authorized, by the Master himself, to perform the duties of an apostle. But was Peter, when he denied Christ, a converted man? Christian character commences at conversion, and as affecting reputation, sins previously committed, cannot disqualify for duties subsequently enjoined. Accordingly, unless it can be shown, that Peter was at that time in a regenerated state, the example fails as an objection. And, of course, the burden of proof rests with the party which may urge it as an objection. But as the design is to establish a principle, rather than to silence an antagonist, the point submitted may be negatively considered.

Did Christ, before Peter's apostacy, recognize him as a converted man? In answering this question, but a single text needs to be examined. It is found in Math. 19 : 28. "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration." Observe about this text :

1. A wonderful diversity of opinion exists respecting it.

2. The word here rendered regeneration, is applied by different commentators to different transformations, sup-

posed to have occurred at different times; but it is believed, that no writer of note has ever understood it to mean the new creation in Christ Jesus. Bloomfield quotes the opinion of several others, and concurs in it, that this "renovation or new state of things" took place at the promulgation of Christianity, after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; or otherwise, to the "regeneration which was then effected by the Gospel;" and he carries the idea, that it was not a change of a personal character, but in the general condition of affairs.

3. In the sense of a moral renovation, Christ was never *regenerated*, and, hence, it must have been in some other sense, that the disciples "followed him in the regeneration."

Did Peter himself claim to be a converted man? If so, *when, where, and in what way?* Did the life of this apostle, as given in the Gospels, furnish any evidence, that up to this date, he had "passed from death unto life?"

Not only his ignorance, but his radical misapprehensions of the character of Christ, of the object of his mission, and of the nature of his kingdom, clearly sustain the opposite conclusion. He evidently regarded him, as in some sense the Saviour only of the Jewish nation, and as intending to break the power of Rome, and establish himself upon the throne of David. His hope of promotion fired his ambition, and he seems to have had no conception of any other advantages to result from his discipleship. In fact, his unbelief respecting the crucifixion and resurrection of the Saviour betrayed something more than the usual obstinacy of human depravity, and rendered him liable to the severe and suggestive rebuke, "Get thee behind me Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of man."

Nor is there in the life of Peter hitherto any particular event, to which so important a change in his heart and habits may be traced. On the contrary, his history from the date of his discipleship, until his denial of his Master, furnishes a noticeable similarity. Everywhere, and upon every occasion, he manifested the same narrowness in his views, the same selfishness in his aspirations, the same petulance in his temper, and the same rashness in his acts and utterances.

But what is most satisfactory, perhaps, on the pending question, is the *contrast between his life before, and after, his*

apostacy. And a single illustration may suffice, though several might be given.

Allusion has already been made to Peter's obstinate unbelief in regard to the crucifixion and resurrection. The account is found in Matt. 16:21—23. The transition which he here underwent was sudden and extreme. The direct personal commendation which Christ bestowed upon him—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona"—in view of his noble confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—had greatly gratified his feelings and excited his hopes. But the startling announcement which immediately followed, that Jesus was soon to "be killed, and be raised again the third day," at once crushed his feelings and his hopes. If this was to be so, if Christ in a short time was to die at Jerusalem, how was his kingdom to be established, and what was to become of the lofty aspirations of this ambitious disciple? The disappointment was more than he could endure, and he faced his Master and disputed the sorrowful prophecy. "Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee." This disputatious unbelief subjected him to the rebuke already noticed.

Now, let any discriminating person study the indications of the "carnal mind," as here brought out, and then turn to Acts 2, and read the wonderful representation which this "Prince of the Apostles" gives of the sufferings, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; his explanations of the prophetic foreshadowings of these fundamental truths; the startling effects which he ascribes to them, and his own unfaltering faith in them, as the only means of salvation to lost sinners; and then say, whether, somewhere between the two occurrences noticed, Peter had not emerged from darkness to light, from a stubborn unbelief to a triumphant and saving faith! Conditions of mind and heart, so directly opposite, could not have been experienced by the same person, without an intermediate change of the most radical character.

It does seem then, that Peter's great sin was committed while he was yet in a sinful state. And this fact, of itself, is sufficient to dispose of his example as an objection to the proposition under consideration. But there is yet another fact, of at least equal weight, which must not be forgotten, though it may be stated in very few words.

Ministerial reputation and responsibility cannot exist back of ministerial commission. An office can only be

disgraced by those who have been entrusted with its functions. At the time Peter denied Christ, he had not received the apostolic commission. Hence, his shameful apostacy brought no disgrace upon the sacred office, nor did it, according to the principle assumed, disqualify him for the performance of its functions.

The example of Peter, then, stands thus: His denial of Christ was, indeed, a scandalous offence; but, at the time, he was neither a converted man, nor a commissioned apostle: therefore, his sin was no disgrace to the sacred office, nor does his subsequent recognition, as an ambassador of Christ, constitute an objection to the proposition, that an apostate minister of the Gospel should be forever excluded from the ministry. Here we leave the objections which it was supposed might be urged, and immediately proceed to the direct argument.

It is worthy of notice, that the Jewish Priesthood was peculiarly guarded against the *imperfect* and the *impure*. The duties enjoined, and the manner in which those duties were to be discharged, are detailed with remarkable particularity. Yet, there is no distinctive classification of the sins, or the penalties, to which the priests, as such, were liable. The reason, doubtless, is to be found in the fact, that there was so little discrimination between the civil and religious, in that peculiar economy. The sanctions of the general code, were evidently sufficiently diversified and severe to prohibit, or punish offences of even a sacrilegious character. Upon this point, it is enough to know, that the excommunicated "were perpetually excluded from all the rights and privileges of the Jewish people." And, that the Priesthood, when guilty of any abuse of the sacerdotal functions, was not exempt from the severest inflictions, is proved by the fearful fate of Nadab and Abihu. So far, therefore, as the Aaronic system bears upon the subject under discussion, it sustains the view sought to be enforced.

The Great Teacher has not described as fully as might have been expected, the character he would have his servants maintain, nor has he given directions how his Church should treat those by whom that character is dishonored. Ecclesiastical troubles have, indeed, a place in the records of the first Christian churches; but, happily, though indiscretions and misunderstandings among the ministers of Christ make up a part of the inspired narra-

tive, no cases of pastoral or apostolical apostacy are found there. The most particular instruction, which the New Testament furnishes respecting ministers, is contained in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus. Here are specifications in regard to Bishops and Elders, which are definite, direct and very comprehensive. When we read, for example, that a Bishop must be of "good behaviour" and "blameless," we know it is implied, that he must not be guilty of crimes or immoralities. And yet, should a case of scandal occur, from such expressions no rules can be derived, respecting the manner in which it should be treated. But there is one requisition added, which is suggestive of relief. A Bishop "must have a good report of them which are without." And this statement is without any qualification. That he "must have a good report," is just as indispensable, as that he "must not be a brawler," or "given to much wine." And, as we find so little, which, by expression or implication, will subserve our purpose, let this text be carefully scrutinized.

1. A Bishop "must have a good report"—reputation—name—among those "which are without"—that is, persons not within the Church—not Christians, unbelievers.

2. This "good report," is necessary, for two reasons at least; as an element of power, and "lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil."

3. If a minister of the Gospel fall into disgraceful wickedness, it is evident, from the statement itself, as well as from the nature of things, that he loses, and can never regain his "good report." (*a.*) His wickedness will never be forgotten. (*b.*) The injury inflicted, will continue to be felt. (*c.*) Such wickedness, followed by such consequences, will always occasion scandal. (*d.*) Penitence in such cases, especially among those "which are without," must be liable to suspicion. (*e.*) In such a state of things the "snare" will be unavoidable. A man, so situated, must be something more than human, if he is not driven to conceal, to palliate, to equivocate, to deny the dark and exceptionable facts in his history. And with such accusations, growing out of such facts, as he must encounter, how can he escape sensitiveness, irritability and resentment?

No servant of Christ can carry his "good report" through apostacy; hence, if he fall, he should never return to the ministry.

Vice or crime, in a character developed and matured, is unmistakable proof of some constitutional, or habitual deflection of such unyielding obstinacy, that neither education, nor grace has reached, or remedied it. Sudden and strong temptation only developes; it can never create the evil. Yielding to temptation, under such circumstances, shows that there was a preparation for it. And if, with such culture, as a minister of the Gospel is supposed to possess, with such restraints as are thrown around such a position, he is once overpowered, though his moral nature may rally under the reaction, yet there can be no security, that succeeding temptations will not be followed by similar results. It is a well established principle, that yielding at the same time strengthens temptation and weakens the power of resistance. Accordingly, the victim is subject to a double disadvantage, and there is a corresponding probability, that his thralldom will be occasional, if not permanent. Is it claimed, that *peculiar circumstances* may render temptation resistless? Be it so; what assurance can be given, that *peculiar circumstances* will not occur in the future, as they have in the past? Should so fearful a risk be incurred against the chances? Should the sanctity of the profession, and the safety of the Church be placed in jeopardy, with such probabilities against them? May the sacred interests of Christ's cause, and the honor of his name, be entrusted to hands which have already betrayed them, upon the frail hope, or the bare possibility, that a weak, or a wicked man, amid all the fluctuations and uncertainties of the future, may never again be tempted as he has been, and repeat the criminality of which he has already shown himself capable? What ecclesiastical body, what church is prepared to assume such responsibilities?

That *past infamy is incompatible with present fidelity*, is clearly involved in what has been said, and is too obvious to require more particular proof or illustration. How can a minister of the Gospel preach against sins, of which, as a minister, he has been guilty? How can he deal with the numerous and offensive violations of the seventh commandment, when his professional reputation is blackened with the sin of adultery? How can he denounce intemperance, while drunkenness makes up a part of his ministerial record? How can he look his audience in the face, as a ministerial thief, and say, "Thou shalt not steal," when their returning gaze sends to his heart the taunt,

"Dost thou steal?" Under the ministrations of such a man, the most revolting iniquity will escape exposure, or the guilty will shield themselves against rebuke, by the Master's own proverb, "Physician heal thyself."

Nor this alone. The Church with such a pastor is powerless in opposing vice. They must be confused and silent, or subject to distressing and paralyzing embarrassment. They stand committed, and if they respect the man of their choice, consistency requires, that they shall not revive the memory of his wrongs by arraying themselves against similar wrongs of others. With their hands thus tied, they are disqualified for aggressive and reformatory labors. And the interests of the Church are not likely to fare much better. No people can entrust their spiritual affairs to such guardianship, without fear and reserve, fatal to the purposes of the pastoral relation. Many secret workings of the heart are matters of doubt and anxiety, to be relieved, only by the discriminating counsel, which a confidential pastor alone is supposed to be able to give. And, surely, none but the eye of purity should be allowed to look into the heart. How can an intelligent mother, for example, with all her sensitiveness and jealous solicitude, send a guileless and unsuspecting daughter to a man for religious instruction and advice, whose past licentiousness is public notoriety? And to a greater, or a less extent, similar embarrassments are felt by all.

Is it claimed, that these objections are serious, only so far as a man's wrongs are known, that fleeing from the sphere of his guilt, his usefulness need not be impaired? Vain hope! the attempt has often been tried, and always proved a failure. It is about as easy to hide away from the divine Omnipresence, as from a ruined reputation. And were it practicable, it would not be honorable. To conceal antecedents, known to be objectionable, as a means of securing position and influence, is downright deception. A minister must be honest respecting his own history. Churches generally act upon the presumption, that ministers are good men, especially if ecclesiastically endorsed. And, acting upon this presumption, if a church is imposed upon by some Reverend renegade, who has escaped the brand of ecclesiastical justice, and distanced the flight of his sullied reputation, the least that can be said, is, they suffer, because he has outraged all truthfulness and candor.

How far religious bodies, in such cases, can be innocent, it might be well to inquire.

If really called to the ministry, it has been maintained, that a man can never silence his convictions, nor be satisfied in any other calling. Hence, it is hinted, that even guilt should not exclude him from the sacred office, as such exclusion must peril his peace for time, if not his salvation for eternity. Without pretending to say how much of truth there may be in the statement, for the present purpose, it is sufficient to reply, that he alone is responsible for the liability. No personal convenience, or interest, may be allowed to counterbalance the purity of the ministry, as the peace of the church. Wisdom suggests, that the convictions of better men are a safer guide.

Will any supplicate forbearance in behalf of *superior talents*? Of what avail are talents, if they cannot shield us from vice and crime! The more elevated the endowments, the more disgraceful and the more inexcusable the fall. Talent, however important, is of less consequence in the ministry, than character. Christ's cause can better do without the abilities, rare as they may be, possessed by this class of men, than to bear the reproach, which they are sure to inflict upon it.

The voice of history, did space permit, might profitably be heard upon this subject. Facts are fearful arguments against all manner of mistakes and mal-administrations, the evils of sin and error can never be fully understood, until they are seen in their consequences. Cases of the description now before us frequently excite sympathy, a generous nature easily gives place to the suggestions of mercy. But alas! after these tender feelings have been outraged again and again, and the faintest hope gives place to blank despair, we too often learn, but not soon enough to avert the evil, that misdirected clemency is little short of cruelty, that endeavors to screen the guilty frequently injure the innocent, and, that unavailing efforts to save a fallen brother wound and disgrace the cause of the Master.

From personal memory, at least a dozen instances of "restoration" after "suspension," or "deposition," for scandalous offences, might be given, the results of not a single one of which, would be mentioned by any fair minded person in favor of the practice of such restoration.

The range of illustration and proof, which has now been

presented, it would seem, ought to be sufficient. If the several lines of argument presented are legitimate, the general conclusion must be irresistible. Yet, there is another field, which must not be entirely neglected, though at the present stage of the discussion, it cannot be extensively traversed.

Neither the Church, nor the bodies which ecclesiastically represent it, can afford to have the confidence of the public lessened in the ministry as a profession. The hope of permanence and success depends, and must largely depend upon the maintenance of that confidence. And *purity* lies at the foundation of it. No intelligent people will be imposed upon by a polluted ministry. Even a church may subserve its selfish ends by *patronizing* a pastor of tainted character; but it will not trust him. Nor will the public sustain the bodies which lay their hands on unholy heads, and hold bad men in ecclesiastical fellowship. If it comes to be true and to be known, that the relations, which these bodies bear to the public, afford no protection against irregularity and impurity, they will cease to be respected, and their mission will be ended. It is not enough for a Synod to satisfy itself; it must satisfy the churches for which it acts, and the public whose confidence it invites, that those it commissions and holds in fellowship, are not only men of proper literary and theological attainments, but of such moral qualities as render them worthy of respect and confidence. And the conditions of continued membership most certainly must not be less elevated than the terms of admission. Ecclesiastical discipline must sustain ecclesiastical standards. It will not do to scrupulously guard the entrance, and utterly neglect the interior. It will not do to be rigid with applicants for "holy orders," and relinquish their accountability as soon as they are admitted. It will not do to carry the idea, that if men can successfully "steal the livery of heaven," they will be at full liberty to "serve the devil" in it as much as they please. The character of the profession, and the confidence which the public repose in it, depend much upon thoroughness of theological culture, but more upon the faithful enforcement of righteous ecclesiastical regulations.

And will the public mind be satisfied with any thing short of the full and final disfranchisement of all ministerial apostates? What has been the verdict in cases of

this kind? What was the decision of the people respecting Onderdonk, Moffat, Johnson and Pomeroy? Could any of those men have continued to perform the functions of the sacred office, upon a confession of guilt, and promise of reformation? Had such a decision been made by any ecclesiastical court respecting any of them, would the public have sanctioned it? Apostates of less note, of course, receive less attention. But the principle in all cases is the same, and should be applied with equal firmness, whether the position of the offender be prominent or obscure.

But, regardless of popular sentiment, with its *purity* the ministry must stand or fall. Can that purity be protected by measures less rigid, less extreme? Degrees of guilt are indicated by grades of punishment. Lessen the penal sanctions of the law, and crimes will be multiplied. Let the vicious escape odium, and vice will increase. Truth and purity cannot be maintained by an appeal to the sense of right, and the fear of God alone. Self-respect and relative respect, as well as safety, must be called in requisition. Many who are morally reckless, are kept within the bounds of decency, by the force of circumstances.

Law and public sentiment protect the virtues and restrain the vices of the people, not less by punishment and proscription, than as a means of education, establishing common standards and uniform habits of thought and action.

Religious communities are governed by the same general principles. Here, as elsewhere, as some minds are constituted, the hope of impunity is a sufficient motive to sin. Under the control of selfishness, and in the direction of gratification, the disposition is to go as far as we can, or dare venture. And here, as elsewhere, the enforcement of law is presumed to fix the limits of safety and interest. Hence, no association will be better than its laws. It is not to be expected, that the faith of the Church will be more truthful than its creed; that its morality will rise above its rules of discipline; that its spirituality will exceed the claims of its covenant. And this view is just as applicable to ecclesiastical bodies, as to the Church. The enforcement of law indicates the standard of morality. Connivance encourages the commission of sin. The example of the fallen must be used to prevent others from falling. Let apostates from the sacred office, be treated as

they should be. Such treatment will keep bad men out, and good men in. If the purity of the profession is to be protected, the same member must not be put in a condition to disgrace it a second time. *Any minister, who by crime or vice once dishonors the sacred office, should be forever excluded from it.*

This proposition has now been tested by the Scriptural view of forgiveness; by Scriptural examples, presumed to be in conflict with it; by the law of the Jewish Priesthood; by the teachings of Paul; by the indications of vice in a cultivated mind; by the bearings of past infamy upon present fidelity; by the influence upon the Church, of being committed to a pastor of sullied reputation; by the voice of history; by the demands of public sentiment; by the law which protects purity, and by some minor points which need not be repeated.

It is not always easy to "deal gently with the erring," and yet make the proper distinctions between the "clean and the unclean." "Right too rigid hardens into wrong," while law, held loosely, encourages crime. Doubt should favor innocence, and possible mistakes should incline to mercy. But sin in holy places must not be winked at, nor must the treasures of heavenly truth be entrusted to the hands of the weak, or the wicked.

ARTICLE V.

DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES.

By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.

I. THE HISTORY OF DANIEL.

Pains have been taken by certain classes of interpreters, German and English,* to make believe, that we know almost nothing of Daniel, the author of the Book of Holy Scripture which bears his name. It has not been because

* Lengerke, De Wette, Davidson, Williams, etc.

ample records are wanting on the subject. Gibbon once said, "the stubborn mind of an infidel is guarded by a secret, incurable suspicion." And it is this "incurable suspicion," this shutting up of the soul against the truth, by a haughty hyper-criticism, this forgone judgment against the supernatural and miraculous, in which we are to find the reason why some men discover no information about "Daniel the Prophet." The truth is, we know more of him, than we do of Adam, Noah or Job; as much, as of Joseph, Isaiah, or Herod the Great; and nearly as much as of Moses, David, or St. Paul.

Three Daniels are spoken of in the Scriptures: one, a son of David, born in Hebron, of Abigail the Carmelitess, referred to, in 1 Chron. 3 : 1; another, a son of Ithamar, who went up with Ezra, after the Babylonish captivity, and of whom we read in Ez. 8 : 2, and Neh. 10 : 6; and the third, the great Daniel, the prophet of God, who wrote one of the most remarkable and important books of the inspired canon.

This Daniel, with whom alone we have here to do, was descended from one of the highest Jewish families, in the last period of the Hebrew monarchy. He was almost certainly of royal blood, born at Jerusalem. He was among the captives, whom Nebuchadnezzar carried away from Judea to Babylon; at which time, he was a boy not over fourteen years of age. Of all the Jewish youths thus transported, he was the foremost in every quality and attainment of body and mind. He was without blemish, skilful in wisdom, cunning in knowledge, understanding science, and having ability in him; which, with his royal blood, soon secured for him an election for service in the king's palace.

For three years he was put under special training for court-duty, and given in charge of the Babylonian eunuchs for that purpose. It had been prophesied by Isaiah to Hezekiah: "Of thy sons which shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and *they shall be eunuchs* in the palace of the king of Babylon," (Is. 39 : 7). The inference is, that in Daniel was this prediction fulfilled, and, that in suffering and privation, he was formed for the place in which he became so conspicuous and notable. His name, also, was changed, partly, as a badge of servitude, partly to obliterate the memory of his early home, but principally, that he might forget the

God of Israel, and become a servant of Nebuchadnezzar's god.

Still, though living among an idolatrous people, put into a school of idolaters, named after an idol god, and serving in the court of an idolatrous king, Daniel never became an idolater. From childhood he had been instructed in the knowledge and law of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, his fathers; and from those teachings he never departed. When but a boy of fourteen, he refused to be persuaded to eat of the king's meats, because they were connected with idol-sacrifices, and were not prepared in accord with Jehovah's law. And so vigorous was his youthful faith, heralding in its simplicity his future greatness, that he trusted in God to uphold his health and strength by pulse and water, quite as well as through the stronger but forbidden food. He was from the first persuaded, and on this persuasion he ever acted—an abiding model for all young men—that abstinence from sinful indulgences is the only sure way to real prosperity in the end. In that faith he succeeded beyond all his heathen companions when a youth. And in that faith he continued, and prospered, from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, through all the changes of empire, and all the extraordinary trials of his high place, down to Cyrus. From early youth one of the judges of Babylon, president over all the colleges of its wise men, head of the heads of all the sections of the empire, amid all the intrigues, indigenous to Oriental despotisms; amid all the envy toward a foreign captive as a councillor of royalty; amid all the troubles incident to the king's seven years insanity, and the murder of two of his successors; amid all the varied changes of the kingdom and its monarchs; he maintained an unbroken political greatness of seventy years, preserved his integrity untarnished, and outlived envy, jealousy and dynasties. Honored during forty years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, entrusted with the king's business under the insolent and sensual Belshazzar, owned by the conquering Medo-Persians, the stay and earthly protector of his people during the dreary years of their exile, the writer most likely of the decree of Cyrus giving leave for their return to the land of their fathers, a worshipper of the true God, in the most dissolute and degraded, as the most grand of the old heathen cities, his life presents one of the rarest pictures the world has ever beheld—a living

poem of faith—a miracle of moral greatness and achievement.

Four times, outside of the Book of Daniel, is this distinguished man referred to. He is twice mentioned by Ezekiel; once for his pre-eminent godliness, and once for his transcendent wisdom. In the one instance, the word is: "Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, * * * though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness," (Ezek. 14 : 13, 14). In the other instance, the prince to Tyre is charged with the presumption of professing to be "wiser than Daniel," (Ezek. 28 : 3). And the Saviour himself is twice said to have referred to him, in full acknowledgement of his eminent character, as a servant and prophet of God. (Matt. 24 : 15; Mark 13 : 14).

II. THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

The Book of Daniel is quite as remarkable as the life of its author. "Daniel," says Jerome, "not only as do other prophets, writes that Christ should come, but also teaches at what time he should come, and arranges the kings in order, and numbers the years, and announces the most evident signs." But for this very reason it has been assailed, and the most extraordinary attempts made to impeach its prophetic character. The natural heart dislikes certainty and definiteness in sacred things. As long as they are left in the mist, capable of being turned and twisted into harmony with any system that may be invented, people are quite willing to have them pass for divine; but so soon as they become fixed, and fasten down upon definite events and dates, the character of which can no longer be doubted, then the proud heart rebels, its lurking unbelief is detected, and the superior clearness and certainty of the thing is made an argument for the rejection of it as not divine. This was the ground upon which Porphyry, in the third century, assailed the inspiration of this book; and the same is the staple of argument on the part of troops of rationalistic critics in modern times.

But, we have no quarrel with the Book on this score, and consider it very unreasonable, that any one else should have. We accept and hold it, from beginning to end, as it stands in the Canon, with perhaps a most trifling exception, as the production of the great Daniel of the cap-

tivity ; and by no possibility the work of any other man. We receive it, at the same time, as an inspired book, unerring in its history, and infallible in its predictions ; yea, one of the noblest and most important individual sections of the Word of God.

It is agreed on all hands, that the Book of Daniel is from one writer. Its style, language, structure, and the interior dependence of one part on another, prove that it was composed by one mind, and proceeded from one author. And, as the production of one author, it is impossible, from the nature of the contents, the language employed, the perfect mastery of facts and their minutiae, and the exactness of allusions, which could not have been known by any one, in the time, to which some have assigned its composition, that it could have been written by any other than the very Daniel whose history it gives, and who so often, in the course of the narrative, claims to be the seer and actor, whose life and visions it records.

It cannot be successfully disputed, that this Book was received into the canon of the Old Testament, as the authentic and sacred work of the Daniel of the captivity, which canon was regarded as complete long before the time of the Maccabees,—the time to which skeptical critics would refer it. With all the scrupulousness of the Jews, as to what they admitted into the catalogue of their sacred books, there is no instance, in which they ever classed the book of Daniel with Apocryphal writings, or doubted concerning its authenticity, or inspiration.

Josephus witnesses, that this Book of Daniel was in existence in the time of Alexander the Great ; that it was shown to that conqueror in Jerusalem by the high priest, as one of the prophetic books of the Jews ; that it told that a Greek should destroy the Persian Empire ; and that Alexander was encouraged by it to undertake his Eastern expeditions, and was so pleased to learn what he had ascertained from it, that he agreed to grant to the Jews whatever favors they might desire of him. *Antiquities*. Tom. XI. chap. VIII. This account is corroborated by other historic facts, viz. : that Alexander was at that time personally in Palestine, that he had an interview with the high priest and others, that the Jews voluntarily surrendered to him, and, that he did treat them favorably. Yet all this occurred more than a century and a half before the time of the Maccabees.

But, above and beyond all this, is the testimony of the Lord Jesus himself. In Matt. 24 : 15, he says : "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation *spoken of by Daniel, the Prophet*, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth let him understand), then," &c. In Mark 13 : 4, the same is again recorded : "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, *spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, standing where it ought not (let him that readeth understand,") &c. The Saviour here recognizes Daniel as a true and real historic personage, the same as Moses, Isaiah or David ; He distinctly ascribes to him the character of an inspired and worthy prophet of God ; He also refers to him as the author of a book, quotes from it as well known, and commands and admonishes, that special attention be given to what is thus prophetically contained in that Book. The world knows of no other "Daniel the Prophet," and of no other Book of Daniel the Prophet, to whose records to give special heed, or which speaks of such an abomination as that, to which the Saviour refers. But we do know, that this very Book of Daniel was in existence in the Saviour's time, that it was then received and held by all as one of the sacred books, and that it does speak of the very thing, to which the Saviour refers. He must, therefore, have had this Daniel, and this Book, in his eye.

Either then, this Book of Daniel is an authentic and inspired production of the man, of whom it speaks, or the Saviour was misled and mistaken. And if the Saviour was in error, he was not God, nor a reliable prophet of God ; and the whole system of Christianity must go by the board as a delusion and a cheat ! The whole religion of the Bible, thus stands or falls with this Book of Daniel. Deny its authenticity and prophetic character, and you strip Christ of all claims to our confidence, and leave no ground for faith at all. And when the matter comes to such a pass, it is time for a criticism, which would fain call itself Christian, to hide its face, and confess, that it has sinned before God and man, in attempting to make believe, that this great and holy Book is a forgery, and unworthy of our regard.

Nor will it answer to bring in half way proposals, to the effect that it were written by some other Daniel, and that its object and tendency was good, though feigned and overstated. Either it is divine and true throughout, or it is an insufferable imposture, and an immoral and untrust-

worthy thing throughout. If another Daniel wrote it, he was a consummate liar, upon a most frightful scale, and in a line of particular aggravation. Even the heathen had better ideas of morality than to allow such forgeries in the name of God, as lawful means of edifying his people. And then, to make the Saviour himself connive at, and sanction, such a cheat, is irremediably fatal to his claims as the Son of God, and to Christianity as the religion of God.

The original Book of Daniel is written in two distinct languages. The first chapter, and the first three verses of the second, is written in Hebrew. From chapter second, verse fourth, to the end of the seventh chapter, it is written in Chaldee. The eighth chapter takes up the Hebrew again, which is continued on to the end.

We have seen it stated, that "it is now utterly impossible to ascertain the reasons why one portion of this Book was written in Chaldee, and another in Hebrew." But this is a misstatement. The reason for the use of the two languages is plainly inferable from the nature of the subjects. Where the language is different, the central subject is different. The early history of Daniel and his companions, is a part of the history of God's people, and so it is written in their national language. It is Hebrew. The account touching Nebuchadnezzar's forgotten dream, its interpretation, and the historical matters following, had reference to the world-power, and the affairs of the empire. It relates to God's dispensations to the heathen, as also Daniel's first vision, which supplements the revelation in the king's dream, expands it, and fills it up. These, therefore, are given in the world's language; which was chiefly employed by the Babylonians, and then understood from the Persian Gulf to Damascus. What comes after the seventh chapter relates also in part to the world-powers; but only as they stand connected with the people of God, the coming of the Christ; and the setting up of his glorious kingdom. The centre is different from the other instances. Hence, the common language of the Prophets is resumed, and what mainly concerns God's people is written in their own language.

There is thus a distinct and ascertainable principle, at once beautiful and just, upon which these different languages are employed. What relates specially to the world

and its empires, is given in the language of the then great head of those empires; and what relates specially to the Divine kingdom and its adherents, trials and triumphs, is given in the sacred language of the chosen people. Thus even in its remote external accidents the Book of Daniel suggests the broad and everlasting difference which exists to the eye and mind of God between his own people, and the common world with which they are in contact. The whole thing argues one author to the Book, and that author not only versed in knowledge and languages as only the Daniel of the captivity was, but also in profoundest internal accord with the spirit of prophecy and the mind of God.

III. THE DANIELIAN THEOLOGY.

The Theology of the Book of Daniel, has also been brought forward as an argument against its genuineness and inspiration. It is hardly worth while to notice such criticism. Within a year or two past, there was found a short poem on a blank leaf of an early copy of the works of John Milton, in the British Museum. It was apparently signed J. M. It was published, as perhaps the production of Milton, and a thousand critics set to work to decide the question. Learned men and adepts pronounced it a genuine Miltonic composition, and that Milton only could have woven "the subtle melody" of its lines. Others, equally wise and experienced, declared it mere rubbish, and that Milton never could have written it, except "in his dotage." And so the controversy goes on, with no prospect that criticism will ever settle whether Milton wrote it or not. How great, therefore, is the presumption and conceit of a certain school of philologists, critics and literary experts, who claim to be able to tell, by internal evidence alone, just what chapters and verses of each particular writer of the Scriptures are from him, and what not! They blate largely about what is Petrine, Pauline, Jehovistic, Elohistie, Maccabean, &c. Wearily picking up out of grammars and vocabularies the dried bits of a dead language, not a word of which they can pronounce as the people who spoke it, they fancy they can feel and detect all variations or idea pertaining or not to each author, and, hence, take upon themselves authoritatively to expurgate the sacred Scriptures, and to cast out this and the other book, or passage from the canon, telling us, that such and

such things are apocryphal, and on no other ground, than that *so their critical sense decides*. And yet here is a poem, in English, the plain English we all speak, English which a child can read and master,—a poem written in London, in the time of Milton,—which Englishmen, fellow-countrymen of Milton, his fellow-townsmen, familiar with every line he ever wrote, critics, experts, poets themselves, cannot tell, if it be John Milton's or not! Out upon such pretensions and attempts to mutilate our Bibles! If the best English critics in the world cannot settle, from internal evidence, whether a poem, in the tongue which they have known from their cradles, is Milton's or not, it is worse than ridiculous for men to presume, upon no better evidence, to decide that the Book of Daniel is not Daniel's work.

But the Book of Daniel does contain a Theology, one which it is the duty of believers to study, one which is particularly rich and clear, and one which it may be very proper to glance at in this connection.

1. *Of God.* The existence of one God, supreme over all things, is clearly taught in this Book. Daniel said to the king, "there is a God in heaven;" 2 : 28. The king is also made to confess, "there is no other God that can deliver after this sort;" 3 : 29. The same is pronounced "the most High," 7 : 25 ; also, "the great and dreadful God," 9 : 4 ; "yea, the God of gods," 11 : 36.

Neither is it some fancied being, that is thus spoken of, different from that one God, who revealed himself to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets of Israel. Daniel worshipped this same God as the God of his Jewish fathers; 2 : 23. The God of the Book of Daniel, is none other than the living and true God, beside whom there is no God.

The God of the Book of Daniel is described as possessed of all the proper attributes of God. He is "God of heaven;" 2 : 8, 37, 44. "Wisdom and might are His;" 2 : 20. "He knoweth what is in darkness, and light dwelleth with him;" 2 : 22. He "liveth forever;" 4 : 34 ; 6 : 20, 26. "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth : and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" 4 : 35 ; He is "King of heaven," "God of gods, and Lord of kings;" 4 : 37 ; 2 : 47 ; 11 : 36. He is "able to deliver his servants;" 3 : 17, 29. He is the God, in whose hand man's breath and all man's ways are; 5 : 23. "All his works

are truth, and his ways judgment;" 4 : 37. He is righteous, 9 : 7, 14, 16 ; "merciful and gracious," 9 : 9 ; hears prayer, 9 : 17, 23 ; 10 : 12 ; is angry with sin, 9 : 16 ; and is able to abase them that walk in pride, 4 : 37.

The God of the Book of Daniel, exercises a particular providence over all the affairs of the world, and all events are ascribed to him. Nebuchadnezzar was made to confess, that "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will;" that "He changeth the times and the seasons ; He removeth kings and setteth up kings ; He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding;" and, that His "dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation;" 2 : 21 ; 4 : 32, 34 ; 6 : 27. The fancied god of Deism and Rationalistic philosophy, who is forever bound by his own laws, and never interferes in any way with their natural operation, is not the God of the Book of Daniel, as he is not the god of any portion of the Bible. Daniel's God is present with all His works, concerned in all that cometh to pass, and ever giving great signs and mighty wonders. He gave Jehoiakim king of Judea into Nebuchadnezzar's hand ; 1 : 2. He brought Daniel into favor ; 1 : 9. He gave the four Hebrew youths knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom ; 1 : 17 ; 2 : 23. He gave Nebuchadnezzar his kingdom, power and glory ; 2 : 37 ; 5 : 18. He sets up and gives out dominion, and creates the kingdom, that is to destroy all other kingdoms, and to stand forever ; 2 : 44. He made known to the king, what was to be in the future ; 2 : 45. He delivered the Hebrew youths from the fiery furnace ; 3 : 29. He decreed the king's humiliation and insanity ; 4 : 24. He numbered and finished the kingdom of Belshazzar ; 5 : 26. He delivered Daniel from the lions ; 6 : 20—22. He giveth judgment to the saints ; 8 : 22. He brought forth his people out of the land of Egypt, scattered them for their sins, and heard when the voice of confession and supplication came up before him ; 9 : 3—23. And He comforteth his anxious ones ; 12 : 19.

In all this, there certainly is nothing discernible, which does not fully accord with both the earlier and later Scriptures, or which we will not do well to accept, believe, and act on, as immutable and most precious truth. The Book of Daniel gives glorious testimony to our all-glorious God.

2. *Of Angels.* It is agreeable to reason and Scripture to believe, that the wide interval between us and God is not a blank, but is filled up with orders of creatures superior to man, who are also largely concerned in the administrations of the Divine government. The existence of such orders is certainly taught in the Book of Daniel, and a very important part is assigned them in the affairs of our world. This has also been objected to this Book, and the system of Angelology which it presents, is said to be a mere transfer from heathen theosophy, and, hence, not entitled to be taken as divine and true.

Nebuchadnezzar, in relating his vision, does indeed, refer to *holy watchers*, after the style of the ancient Zoroastrian religionists, who recognized secondary deities under this name. According to the Zend-Avesta "Ormuzd has set four *watchers* in the four quarters of the heavens, to keep their eye upon the host of the stars. One stands here as the *watcher* of his circle; the other, there. He has placed them at such and such posts, as *watchers* over such and such a circle of the heavenly regions; and this by his own power and might." Such was the religion taught this heathen king. He knew nothing of the true Bible doctrine, or the subject of angels. And, when he had a vision from God, and beheld in it the movements of angels of God, how was it possible for him to describe them, except in the language and conceptions of his own polytheistic system? He called them by the name of the Zoroastrian sub-deities, because he knew no other name, and knew of no such heavenly beings except as his theosophy fancied. Daniel does not say, that these angels were the Zoroastrian watchers. He whom the king described as a Zoroastrian *watcher*, the prophet plainly identifies, not as a heathen sub-deity, but as a messenger of the true God of heaven and earth; and the decree which the watchers uttered, he interprets as "the decree of the most High," given into the hands of angels to execute. There is nothing Magian, or at all different from the common Scriptural teaching, or the subject either before and since Daniel's time.

Daniel uses various designations for these heavenly agents. He calls them "*angels*," 6 : 21; *ministering ones*, 7 : 10; *holy ones*, 8 : 13, 14; *chief princes*, and *princes*, 10 : 13, 20; 12 : 1. He also gives the proper names of some of them; Gabriel, 9 : 21; Michael, 10 : 13; 12 : 1.

He describes the aspects of the angels as prevaillingly human, but very exalted and glorious, 5 : 24; 8 : 16, 26; 10 : 5, 6, 17; 12 : 7. One in particular, he represents as a man, clothed in linen, girded with fine gold of Uphaz, whose body was like the beryl, his face as the appearance of lightning, his eyes as lamps of fire, his arms and feet resembling polished brass, and his voice like the voice of a multitude; 10 : 5, 6.

He also represents these celestial beings as exceedingly numerous. In his vision of the Ancient of days, he beheld "thousand thousands ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand, standing before Him;" 7 : 9, 10.

The office he assigns to angels, is the office of creatures only, and that of ministering organs of the Divine providence and government. They conveyed a knowledge of God's purposes to Nebuchadnezzar; 4 : 13—17, 24. One of them was sent to hinder the lions from harming the wronged prophet; 6 : 22. One of them acted as God's messenger to interpret to Daniel his vision of the four beasts; 7 : 16. Gabriel performed a like office with reference to the vision of the ram and goat, 8 : 16—26; and the seventy weeks, 9 : 21—27. And still another acted as his hierophant in all the remaining visions. Others of them are represented as serving as heavenly guardians of God's people, and their helpers and princes; particularly Michael, the great prince, and one of the chief princes, who standeth for the children of the prophets' people; 10 : 13; 12 : 1.

Daniel says nothing very special about *bad* angels. And yet, it would seem as if some of these mysterious principalities and powers were to be considered as evil, and antagonistic to God and his gracious purposes. We read of "the prince of the kingdom of Persia," 10 : 13; and "the prince of Grecia," 10 : 20; both of whom belong to these angelic potencies, and both of whom are represented as seeking to hinder the good angel, who was in converse with Daniel, and really so antagonistic, as to call forth violence to keep down their resistance; 10 : 20.

But, whether only good, or only some good and others evil, they are of various ranks and degrees of dignity. This particularly is objected against Daniel, as the mere fancy of Oriental Magianism. But such it is not. Distinctions among the heavenly hosts were revealed from the

first; and it would be out of harmony with all we know of God's creations, if such distinctions did not exist. We read of cherubim at the gates of Paradise, and specifically of "the angel of the Lord"—of morning stars singing together, and of Sons of God shouting for joy when the world was made—of seraphim and cherubim, crying the triune *Sanctus* before God—of chariots and horsemen, that make up the army of God, and the Captain of the Lord's hosts,—and all, long before the days of Daniel. That he should speak of these heavenly beings, therefore, as of different orders and degrees of rank, is in perfect harmony with what was revealed and recorded in the books of God before he wrote. And, that he should bring out the subject with greater conspicuity, is in perfect keeping with that progress of doctrine, so manifest in the whole method of revelation. If later prophets are to be considered as adding nothing to what was given by preceding ones, there was no real occasion for them, and we may as well burn all the sacred books after the Pentateuch. In harmony with the Scriptures in general, and only with greater clearness, does Daniel thus show us the differences of order among these heavenly intelligences, and their potency in human history, and the life of nations and nature. Compare also Col. 1: 16; 1 Thess. 4: 16; John 5: 4; Heb. 1: 7; Rev. 7: 1—3; 14: 8; 16: 5; &c.

3. *Of The Christ.* "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." If prophets have in them nothing referring to the Christ, or leading the way to Him, we may safely assume, that they are none of God's prophets. But Daniel shows no deficiency in this particular. Nay, he has only too much, and that too definite and particular, to say about the Christ, to suit our rationalistic theologasters. Having not much occasion for a Saviour in their systems of thinking, of course, a book which makes so much of Him is quite at variance with their instincts of the truth, and hence, they would set it aside as apocryphal.

From the earliest ages, and among the chosen people throughout their history, the coming of One who should be the Deliverer and Saviour of all his, was not only hoped for, but this hope was the great centre of all their prophecies and all their ceremonies. That coming One was known by a variety of names; but by none more common than *Messiah*, an *anointed One*—*God's anointed*; Ps. 2: 2. Daniel speaks of this coming One, and calls

Him absolutely and distinctively *Messiah*; 9 : 25, 26. He calls Him "*Messiah-Nagid*"—*Messiah the Prince*—the supreme Ruler—the One that goes in and out before the people in the administration of government. In the same manner is *Messiah* described in the earlier Scriptures; Is. 9 : 7; 55 : 4; Micah 5 : 1; Ezek. 34 : 23.

The office, or work of the *Messiah*, is also distinctly described. He was to "finish the transgression;" that is, to restrain it, shut it up from overflowing, stop it;—to "make an end of sin;" seal it up, cover it;—to "make reconciliation for iniquity;" appease wrath with reference to it, give satisfaction for it, restore the peace which it had broken;—to "bring in everlasting righteousness;" produce a just basis for the justification of sinners, and for the deliverance of them from condemnation:—to "seal vision and prophecy;" that is, consummate, establish, fulfill and complete them, settling them as true, and bringing to their end the things foreshown in them. 8 : 24.

His qualification for all this, and the manner of accomplishing it, are also given. He is referred to, as capable of suffering, 9 : 26; and yet is described as "*The Most Holy*," 9 : 24. He was to endure a death penalty—"be cut off." The word *carath* constantly denotes a penal excision—a cutting off for sin—a violent death for offence against the law. Thus was the *Messiah* to be "cut off," as also expressed by Isaiah 53. But he was to be cut off "*not for himself*." His was to be a *vicarious* suffering—the endurance of penal inflictions for the sake, and in the place, of others, 9 : 26.

But other works and grander administrations than these are ascribed to him. There is princely rulership and heavenly dominion assigned to Him, as well as earthly humiliation. He comes in the clouds of heaven, and dominion, glory and a kingdom are given Him, that all peoples should serve Him, all nations obey Him, and His kingdom never end, 7 : 13, 14, 27.

This King is described as of human birth, "*the Son of man*," 7 : 13. The word *bar*, denotes descent; and *bar-anash*, descent from man. And yet he is further described, as much more than man, and truly Divine. He is accompanied by angels to the throne of God, in that Majesty which had, before Daniel in this place, been spoken of God only, "coming with the clouds of heaven," 7 : 13. As God manifested Himself in the cloud in the Exodus, the

wilderness, the tabernacle, the temple, and as the clouds hide from us all that is beyond them, so they are spoken of continually as the visible hiding-place of the invisible Presence of God. To ascribe to any being a place there, was to associate him with the prerogative of God, who maketh the cloud His chariot, about whom are clouds and darkness, whose pavilion round about Him are thick clouds of the sky, who rideth upon the swift cloud, and the clouds are the dust of His feet. Compare 3 : 25. Even the rationalistic and skeptical critics agree, that in the Book of Daniel "the Messiah appears as a superhuman being," and has "qualities and attributes of Jehovah transferred to him."

Neither is this a mere imitation of Ezekiel, taken from the Sibylline books in the time of the Maccabees, as these men would teach us. It is the common doctrine of the preceding Scriptures. Jesus himself cited the 110th Psalm in proof of his Divinity, Matt. 22 : 41—45. He there appears as David's Lord, sitting at the right hand of God, a King whose power none could withstand; and as God, and the Son of God, whose throne is forever; Heb. 1 : 8. Isaiah had declared concerning that son which was to be born into the world, and whose administration was to be so glorious, that his name should be called, and so Himself also be, "Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace;" Is. 9 : 6. He had also been announced as to be born of a Virgin, and that His name should be Immanuel, God with us; Is. 7 : 14. Micah, the contemporary of Isaiah, had prophesied His birth at Bethlehem to be the Ruler of Israel, with the going forth from the old, from the days of eternity; 5 : 1. Zechariah speaks of Him as God's Fellow, 13 : 7; and Malachi as the Lord whom Israel sought, 3 : 1; all answering to the Saviour's own account of himself, that he was before Abraham, that he came forth from the Father, that he is one with the Father, and that whosoever saw him, saw the Father, of whom he is the only begotten Son.

As to the two-fold coming of Christ, like all the ancient Scriptures, the Book of Daniel does not clearly distinguish between them. There is a coming as the Son of man, ending in violent death, which referred to the advent in the flesh; and there is also a coming in the clouds of hea-

ven, as a triumphing Judge, and an everlasting and worshipful Ruler, 7 : 13, 16. But, exactly what relation the one had to the other, remained to be developed long afterwards. To reconcile these two pictures, quite comprehensible now, the ancient Rabbins conceived of two Messiahs, or a change in the manner of Christ's coming, according as they might prove themselves worthy or unworthy.

Of all the prophets, Daniel is the only one, by whom was revealed the definite *time* of the Saviour's Advent; 9 : 24—26.

4. *Of the State of Man and the Securement of Divine Favor.* It has been objected to the Book of Daniel, that its tone is ascetic and Pharisaic, after the style of the later Jews. This is about equal to all the rest of this class of objections, without foundation.

A general and dreadful corruption of humanity is certainly implied. Profoundly penitential is the confession which Daniel makes of the sins of his people, not excepting himself; even though they are contemplated as the best of the race, and of all men the most favored of God, 9 : 4—19. And in answer to this confession and prayer, Gabriel announces the Messiah, as the One through whom atonement should be made, transgression restrained, sins stayed, righteousness brought in, and the sin penalty taken away, 9 : 21—26. Is this un-evangelical? Is it not in thorough accord with prophets and apostles?

Great power is assigned to self-humiliation and prayer, 2 : 18, 19; 6 : 11; 9 : 3; 10 : 2; but to say, that this is superstitiously exaggerated, is to fly into the face of the Scriptures, and the recorded experiences of the saints in all ages, before and since. The truth is, that there is nothing like humble and earnest prayer. It puts all the resources of Omnipotence at the command of man; provided only, that he asks no unreasonable, unnecessary, or wrong thing. Jesus himself says: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you." John 55 : 7; 16 : 23. And prayer, such as Daniel's, belonged to the exercise of living faith, which is the hand that takes hold upon God's salvation, according to all the Scriptures.

That he should advise Nebuchadnezzar to escape from his sins by righteousness, from his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor, 4 : 27, was simply the common doc-

trine of repentance, which requires the breaking off of sin by its opposite, a thing forever requisite to forgiveness. It was the same that Jonah preached to the Ninevites, which the Saviour himself accepted in Zaccheus, and which ever goes along with the proclamation of the Gospel. It was just that lesson which John, the Baptizer, urged upon Herod, Paul upon Felix, and that any preacher of righteousness would lay down to a proud, unjust and oppressive heathen despot. And it is written in the New Testament as well as the Old, that the merciful shall obtain mercy; whether unto everlasting life or not, is another question, upon which Daniel's advice does not touch.

That he should resort to fasting, and abstinence from pleasant food, on two great public occasions—the approaching close of the years of captivity, and the hindrances interposed to the rebuilding of the temple by the councillors of Cyrus,—was just what God had commanded through Joel to be done in times of trouble, and what had been acceptably done by many before him. Even the Saviour himself has given directions for like occasions, and has told us, that there are some evils which cannot be dislodged without it. And that Christian is deficient in some of the most vital impulses of true godliness, who cannot see and feel the propriety, at times at least, of just such abnegations in connection with special applications for the help of God.

The Book of Daniel contemplates the mercy and favor of God as belonging to those who persistently and faithfully abjure all idolatry from the worship of the true God only. This is the great lesson of the account of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; 3 : 13—28. True piety is located in love to God, the keeping of His commandments, and earnest seeking unto Him with penitence, prayer and faith; 9 : 3, 4. God's people are such that depart not from His precepts and judgments, 9 : 5; but hearken unto His servants the prophets, 9 : 6; obey the voice of the Lord, and walk in his ways, 9 : 10; turn from iniquities, and understand the truth, 9 : 13. And to all such the mercies and forgiveness of God, and all the promises of His covenant, are made to apply, 9 : 4, 9; 10 : 12. Surely, this is neither Pharisaic nor unevangelical. It is God's own truth.

5. *Of the Consummation.* The Book of Daniel says nothing about heaven, as a place of abode for the righteous.

The whole blessedness of man, in its highest consummation, is connected with the setting up of a kingdom, which the God of heaven is to set up, which shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and shall stand for ever, 2 : 44. It is a kingdom which is finally to supersede and take the place of the present world powers, 2 : 44. It is established by the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, 7 : 13, 14. It is not fully manifested till after the judgment shall sit, 7 : 26, 27. It is a kingdom over the earth, under the heaven, 7 : 27. Men and nations as they dwell upon the earth are to be the subjects of it, 7 : 14. The Son of man is to be the personal possessor of this kingdom, and all its glory, dominion and authority, 7 : 13, 14, 27. The saints are to have a share in this kingdom, and in the administration of its affairs, 7 : 18, 27. It is to be eternal, 2 : 44; 7 : 14, 18. The Prince of this kingdom was to come as a sufferer at the end of sixty-nine hebdomads from the decree of the authorities at Babylon to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, 9 : 25, 26. Great calamities and destructions were to befall Jerusalem and its people subsequent to this restoration, before the predicted kingdom should be manifested in its full glory, 9 : 26, 27; 11 : 21—45; 12 : 1. The saints of God are to be oppressed and sufferers in this world, until the judgment shall sit, 7 : 19—27. Those of the Lord's people who die meanwhile, are in a state of hopeful rest, 12 : 13. There will be two resurrections of the dead, one to everlasting life, and one to shame and everlasting contempt, 12 : 2. The righteous and the faithful are to have a most exalted lot in the time of their resurrection, 12 : 3, 13. The end of all God's present administrations with men, and the consummation of all His gracious purposes, will have been accomplished with the final setting up of this glorious kingdom of the Son of man and His saints, 7 : 28; 8 : 19; 9 : 24; 12 : 4, 6—13.

There are other points of even greater interest, but we cannot pursue them, at present. If any one is attracted to a closer study of this noble prophet and his noble book from what we have written, these notes will not have been presented in vain.

R

ARTICLE VI.

THE RELATION OF THE TEXT TO THE SERMON. BY DR. KAHLE, PASTOR AT CAYMEN. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.

By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Ind.

Some years ago Pastor Sulze of Osnabrück, was called to the Jacobi church in Chemnitz, by the City Council of that place. And, since in Saxony, it is required of every preacher, at his induction into office, that he attest his allegiance to the Confessions by an oath, with reference to which Sulze had conscientious scruples, he entered into an inquiry with the Church government of Saxony, and the result was, that he declined the call to Chemnitz, and published a document entitled: "The Bible and the Confessions," in which he tried to show, that the Confessions of the Reformation period were not binding upon us in their *form*, but only in their life-germ, Christ. In one section of this book (§ 14, p. 80), the author gives his view of the relation which the Holy Scriptures sustain to the Sermon, and he asserts, that the weakness and inefficiency of most sermons is owing to the fact, more especially, that the present preaching upon biblical lessons does not afford a full enjoyment of the Scriptures, nor lead to any free and immediate edification. To explain the Scriptures is a different thing from preaching. Sulze advises: "Let a preacher make, according to the established rules, simple comments, in a running order, which shall familiarize the congregation with the Scriptures. Let him interrupt this order only then, when his heart prompts him to say something in an immediate way to the congregation; only then let him preach a regular sermon, and that without a text." Although this good counsel borders on the comical, and reminds one of the proposition which Bengel (*Life of Burk*, 2 ed. p. 579) has recorded in his traveling diary as a curiosity: "One should not preach too often and especially at not stated periods, but rather have the church bell rung, when in a mood for preaching," yet the Editor of a

new homiletical periodical, published by Wigand in Leipzig, and entitled, "The Preaching of our Times," has joined himself to Sulze's notion, and appealed to Cl. Harms, who, "as is well known, frequently preached without any Bible text at all."

To this it may be replied in the first place, that Cl. Harms, "as is well known," did not do this "frequently," but only a few times, and in his "Pastoral Theology," (I. 83) he says explicitly: "He would allow this practice only in exceptional cases, in addition to other reasons, also for this one belonging to pastoral theology: the congregation loses its safeguard, or that which is at least regarded as such, that such a sermon is really the Word of God." But if the long list of contributors to "The Sermon of the Present," should appear imposing to any one, we might appeal from them for the necessity of Bible texts to the Sermon, to the *Consensus gentium*, and not only to the *Consensus* of all homiletical authorities, not even Vinet excepted.

When in the year 1851, Ad. Riff, in the "Contributions to Theological Science," (published by Reuss & Cunitz, 2 parts, Jena,) attacked the use of Bible texts more severely than was done by Sulze, he was scarcely thought of, and still less deemed worthy of a reply. Even preachers, who otherwise conform themselves pedantically to the revised Liturgy of 1829, depart from it in that particular, that they do not venture to separate the sermon from the text, to the extent therein recommended, (p. 5) according to which either the Gospel or the Epistle may, when read, be designated as the text for the sermon following, and the pericope thus read is not to be announced again from the pulpit. N. B. After the second pericope, the creed, the *sanctus*, the general church prayer, the Lord's prayer and the principal hymn have come in between, if possible. If any one could allow himself to read the text from the altar, or even, as is often the case in cities, to have it read by the deacon, and then a half hour later, to preach the sermon on it, that, indeed, would be preaching without a text. We, at least, call the sermons of Chrysostomus, and of other pulpit orators of the ancient Greek church, textless, although they are, without doubt, made with reference to the Scriptural lesson read in the liturgical part of the service, (the ἀναγνώσματα). But the *sensus communis* of our day protests against a Sermon, which would con-

vey the impression: "He speaketh of his own," and it is interesting to see how men of the most diverse tendency defend the use of a regular text from the Bible. I shall content myself with placing together the opinion of two men, who are looked upon by most of us with special reverence, namely: Rosenkranz and Nitzsch. Rosenkranz (*Theol. Encykl.* 2nd ed. p. 366,) draws the lines, inside of which the Sermon can have free play, as wide as possible. "The matter of the Sermon," he says, "is in the abstract the whole faith, in the concrete the whole life. Nothing human, nothing divine, is in itself excluded from it. It may rise to the greatest height, and descend into the deepest depth. The eternal being of God, the wonders of nature, the changes of history, the metamorphoses of mind, the ideal of the Redeemer, the struggle of asceticism, the crises of time—all offers itself as suitable for the contents of the sermon." "But," he continues (p. 367), "although it is entirely possible to make a Christian Sermon without any direct connection with the Bible text, nevertheless, the practice of taking a text is to be retained, so as to guard against branching off into heterogenous speaking." And Nitzsch (*Pract. Theol.* II, § 123), gives four reasons why the Sermon should not be without a text: (1.) The Word is to be made known in its character of a message; (2.) The Church wants a guaranty that divine truths, pertaining to the kingdom of God and the congregation, shall be preached; (3.) The biblical appearance of the truth maintains the order of a life-union between the dogmatical and the ethical element, and (4.) The sermon has always been textual in the Christian Church. I may be allowed to add a fifth reason, which, however, does not apply to such thinkers as Nitzsch and Rosenkranz; it is this: the poverty of thought with many preachers is supplemented by the richness of the Bible text, or differently stated: I would not regard myself as knowing anything for my congregation, without my Bible text alone. According to Nitzsch the text is so essential to the Sermon, that he has embraced it in his definition of the Sermon. "The Sermon," he says, (*Ibid.* § 101), "is an annunciation of the Word of God, as represented in the Holy Bible text, which is made with living reference to present circumstances and through called witnesses." And, indeed, if we would define the sermon, as it now is, and not as it has been in its historic beginnings, or in its transition periods, we are compelled to say:

a sermon without a text is no sermon at all. That short definition which Schnur of Mühlhausen gave in the *Ev. Gemeindeblatt* (1855, p. 198): "The sermon is an address made in the name of Christ, to His congregation and to His glory," is too general, however learnedly it was defended, even with an appeal to Homer's heralds. The Christian *κῆρυξ* differs from the Homeric in this, more especially, that whilst the learned are not agreed what the *κῆρυκες* of Homeric times really had to do and to announce, the trumpet of the Christian preacher gives no uncertain sound: "Thus it is written, that Christ must suffer and rise again on the third day from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sin be preached in His name."

The preaching of the Apostles, was indeed, generally without a text. They did not always do as Philip, the Evangelist, who (Acts 8 : 35) opened his mouth and began at the same Scripture which the Ethiopian eunuch just read (Is. 53,) and preached unto him the Gospel of Jesus. They did not always take their matter from the evangelical history, which Christ had ordered to be preached in its manifest parts, for He had ordered, that where in the whole world the Gospel of His death was preached, there Mary, who had anointed him in Bethany, should be honorably remembered. If Peter commences his sermon in Cesarea, (Acts 10 : 37). "That word ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," we may conclude, that the Apostles made known, above all things, the acts of mercy and the miraculous healings of Jesus, and especially the Gospel story, before hearers who were not acquainted with these things, and that based upon their apostolic teachings. Of the resurrection of Christ, the Acts of the Apostles, and 1 Cor. 15, bear sufficient testimony. But, there also, are sermons of Paul, in which not a single quotation from the O. T. occurs, no entering into the details of evangelical history, not even a direct reference to any expression of Christ, for example, the Epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, the first to the Thessalonians. It has already been remarked, that the Sermon of the ancient Greek Church, in so far, as it is not a Homily, has generally no Bible text. The Sermon of Ambrosius, preparatory to

the Christmas festival, which Nesselmann cites, is also without a text. The same authority (p. XLVII,) cites a sermon from the middle ages of Peter Damiani (died 1072), as translated by Augusti, which, without any text, gives first the praise of John, thereupon his comparison with Peter, then his pre-eminence above all the disciples, and, finally, his benefit to us. It is more generally known, that the preaching monks preached often without a text. Berthold developes, in a sermon without a text, seven principal virtues from the seven planets, and the seven days of the week. Geiler, of Kaisersberg, has no text to any one of the forty-two sermons, that constitute his "Paradise for Souls." Catechetical sermons, are even now, quite frequently made without a text from the Bible. And, that among the many sermons, to which a text is prefixed only as a motto, there are not only bad ones, but also very good ones, which, therefore, seem to defend the neglect of taking a text for the sermon, there is no doubt. But all these exceptions only establish the rule. And, indeed, there are three exceptional cases, in which historically, and from inherent considerations, preaching without a text can be defended.

1. The missionary sermon, which is constantly tending to run into the catechetical. I should regard him a poor missionary, who would know no other way of preaching to the heathen, than with the Bible in hand, and by expounding single texts, instead of, like the Saviour, taking the matter of his sermon from the well, and the bread, or like Paul, from the altar to the unknown God, and from the question of the trembling jailer; but in the one, as well as the other, can preach with demonstration of the Spirit and power of Christ as our righteousness and strength.

2. The festival and occasional sermon, which, as such, is more of a casual address, than a sermon, for certainly Ebrard, (Ibid. § 189,) goes too far, when he says of the casual address: "It must start from a text, if it would merit the name of being an act of divine service." The fact, upon which the festival is founded, and the occasions requiring the casual address, are sometimes enough of a text. If ever, then it is upon the great festivals, that the Holy Ghost, through the preacher, and not he of himself, must preach the Gospel. The festival sermon must, as Harms

expresses it, be a priestly sermon and not a preacher sermon. Whoever has the Holy Ghost, his oil cruse will have no lack; he draws out of the fulness; the anointing teaches him all things, he needs not that any one instruct him. The single text soon becomes a restraint to the festival orator. And for the occasional sermon only, that text would be suitable, that is covered by the occasion, or the circumstances and scope, that naturally surround the speaker; it is more unbecoming to the pulpit to hang a *quasi* text on to the sermon, than to make a sermon full of the spirit of Jesus Christ without any text; but to find a third something in this dilemma, is not always possible. Think of the sermon of Strauss of the year 1831 to recommend the Liturgy: "Every Sunday an Easterday," which is demonstrated (*a.*) from its inherent signification, (*b.*) from the religious celebration of it. It is a master sermon that outlived several editions; but the text prefixed to it: "Sing unto the Lord, praise His name, make known his salvation from one day to another"—is no text at all, and it related to the sermon not much better than when preachers of the seventeenth century preceded their regular sermon on the pericope, by another one on some arbitrary text. Extraordinary genius and extraordinary inducements may also justify the departure from the ordinary custom of textual preaching. With this, however, I do not wish to be understood, that every festival and occasional sermon can do without the Bible text. Let us not forget the exhortation of our ecclesiastical superior, (Moll referred to above, §659) that the sermon, as an essential part of public worship, should not depend upon Quaker-like excitement, nor should unscriptural whims be countenanced in preaching; and in every single case, where we allow ourselves to depart from the rule, we will carefully examine whether it can be reconciled with that principle of order in worship, to which the apostle Paul refers (1 Cor. 14: 40), and whether we do not injure the edificational interest, when we neglect to let the tones of the text just read enter the heart with their heavenly echo and their solemn impressiveness.

3. The third exception is created by sermons with those texts, which are not directly, rather indirectly, taken from the words of the Bible: such as sermons on the Catechism, the Augsburg Confession, on Hymns and the like. In all these cases it is advisable to place the biblical source

of the general text at the head as principal text, according to the example of Spener, who, in his later years, delivered sermons on "Arndt's True Christianity," and in the first sermon he says: "Your Christian love will prevent you from thinking, that I am about to preach on Arndt to you in a regular manner; I am rather going to preach to you about the Word of God, the texts of Scripture, but in the order in which this blessed man has treated of them. Thus we find too, at the head of every sermon, the Bible text of the particular chapter of Arndt. And in the sermon on the preface of the second book, Spener says: Because John Arndt has placed no special text to this preface, we will take the general passage, (Matt. 7 : 14,) which he used for his three books, for our foundation. Spener knew how to avoid the imminent danger, that the text should be used only as device; but rather than that the Bible passage should be an assistant text only, it is certainly better to content oneself with the indirect Word of God, the text which the hymn, the catechism, etc., afford. Draeseke delivered the memorial sermon of Frederick William III, on the text: "*Was Gott thut, das ist wohl gethan*," (What God does, is done well). "This melody," he says, "may quiet the mourners, and characterize the departed, for according to this melody, the life of the king moved, namely: his mind, his action, his courage and his death." After announcing this hymn for his text, he remarks: "If in addition, you need an express Bible passage, then let it be the exhortation of the Old Testament: "Commit thy way unto the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thy heart;" let it be the Confession of the New Covenant: "The Lord hath done all things well." I ask now, did the sermon, because of this addition, become a sermon on a Bible text? Certainly not; but it is, and remains a sermon on the text of a hymn. Here it seems to me the question will be interposed, whether at all or not sermons are to be allowed on anything less than the direct Word of God. I shall not speak of the catechetical sermon any further, first, because the Lutheran Catechism contains in all but the second part, the direct Word of God, and secondly, because the most of practical ministers, if I am not mistaken, are satisfied of the usefulness of sermons on the Catechism. In the end, it is of less importance what harmonizes with the idea of protestant *cultus*, than what benefits the people. In this department,

the voice of a public school teacher, like Nissen, who, in the introduction to his excellent explanation of the Catechism, begs so urgently for Sermons on the Catechism, is to be respected as much as that of a theorizer like Ebrard, who wants to banish the Catechism from the Sermon entirely, because of its metanvetical purpose, and who is yet so inconsistent, as to admit, that since catechisation did not accomplish its object with every individual a certain metanvetical activity must work itself into *Cultus*. I am more concerned to rid the Sermon on hymns of the bad repute into which good theory and bad practice has brought it. As much as it is contrary to good taste, to announce the theme and the divisions in common poetry, and strange, that Ebrard can defend this sort of division, although he does it under the genteel name: "Lines that form a verse," just as much is it to be recommended, that now and then a good hymn of our Church, form the main trunk of a sermon. And, I venture to defend the hymn Sermon, although Nitzsch, also, declares himself against it, and asserts: "Sermons on church formula, hymns and the like, had occurred only then where the consciousness of the purpose of the Sermon had been lost." Whoever has intercourse with the people, know that the hymn-book is the lay-Bible, the *biblia pauperum*. The Bible Society may yet hold more than one jubilee before the people can read the Bible for private edification. A far higher degree of popular education is necessary to that effect, than has been attained thus far by our public schools, with and without regulation. The aged Dinter, who, as friend and foe must acknowledge, with his whole soul clung to the people, who thought, wrote, and worked for the people, has along with his Gospel postils, also published homilies on hymns. The principal argument for the evangelical pericopes, upon which, however, little stress is generally laid in the discussions for and against the pericopes, that, namely: the common people find the most edification in Sermons on texts which are familiar, is also favorable to Sermons upon the familiar hymns. From those times, in which the taste for hymns had not yet become so corrupt, we have several Sermons, as, for instance, one by Buronerus, (Salzwedel 1677) on the hymn of Hans Sachs: "Why art thou sad, my heart?" with the title—"House comfort for poor people;" one of Scriver in his *Seelenschatz*, (1680, II. pp. 786—845) on the hymn of Frank: "O, how worthless, O,

how brief," with the theme: "The vanity despised by believing souls." There are ten Sermons of Schleupner, with the title: "Blessed ascension of the saints," Leipzig, 1619," on the hymn: "When my hour has come," which has often furnished a funeral text in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Also, on the hymns: "*Gott sei Dank durch alle Welt*," "*Herr Jesu Christ, du höchstes Gut*," "*Wil schoen leuchtet der Morgenstern*," there are sermons upon record, as mentioned by Koch, in his history of Church Hymns, Vol. IV. pp. 121, 332, 397.

After we have now, by the grace of God, had restored unto us the church-hymn in all its original biblical power and fulness, it might be regarded as timely to acquaint the people more fully with this treasure in Sermons upon hymns, and, thus, also to contribute toward the understanding of the sacred Scriptures. But only such hymns are to be used, over which a passage of Scripture can be placed as a text, although I do not think it essential, that such should be done in all cases. Who would be offended, if I were to announce a Sermon on the 130th Psalm, and would read this Psalm as Luther has given it to us in the hymn: "In deep distress I cry to Thee?" For Dr. Nicolaus Selnecker, one of the co-workers in getting up the Formula of Concord, in explaining this Psalm, did not use the Bible text, but Luther's hymn version of it. The text: "In our poor flesh and blood is clothed the eternal Good," would be suitable for Christmas Sermons, as was once admitted in the *Ev. Gemeindeblatt*, and a congregation would not complain if one would preach on that text from year to year. Still this class of Sermons without Bible texts, though they be ever so well fortified with the Word of God, must be regarded as exceptions to the rule. For no collection of hymns, no symbolical book, can be placed upon a level with the Word of God, the "Scriptures given by inspiration of God." "There is a majesty in the sacred Scriptures, that inspires fear, and makes all those who have forsaken the right paths to tremble; but to them who carry it in their hearts, it gives sweet rest," (Justin Martyr). "For faith cometh by preaching, and preaching by the Word of God," (Rom. 10 : 17.)

Still, if we would investigate the relation which the Bible text sustains to the Sermon, we must not only inquire *whether*, but also *how* the Sermon is bound to the Bible text. In this relation, I would give four homiletical

rules. The Sermon must be (1) textual, (text gemäss,) (2) related to the text, (text verwandt,) (3) exhaustive of the text, (text erschöpfend,) and (4) mastering the text, (text beherrschend).

Textuality requires, that we do not leave the text untouched, and what is yet more important, that we do not wrest the Scriptures, but preach the Word of God in its purity, nor bring things into the text, which were as far from the mind of the writer, as heaven is from earth, though they may otherwise be biblical and true. Allegorical explanations of the text, are forbidden by this Canon in a general way; allegory is allowable only in cases, where either the text indicates it, as in the Epistle for *Lætare*, and in the Gospel for that day, at the close: "This is indeed the Prophet who was to come into the world," as also the following parable justifies it, that we understand the bread to be the symbol of the Word of God, or when the ancient custom of the Church, and the reference of the pericope to the season of the year points to a parabolic signification. Thus, for instance, the Gospel of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, has, on the Sunday before Easter, been explained historically, and on the first Sunday in Advent allegorically, and the parable of the good Samaritan has been applied to Christ. But an arbitrary allegorizing is to be rejected, because it does violence to the text. The child-like simplicity of faith, and the hearty love of Jesus, which characterized a Valerius Herberger, we may imitate, but not his allegorical interpretations, as when at the two pieces of wood which the woman of Zarephath picked up, (1 Kings 17 : 12,) he thinks of the two cross-pieces of the Cross of Christ. To this textuality also belongs, that we do not only select the real foundation thought of the text, and, that our division be suitable to the text, but, that we also remain true to the text, as our guiding star in our train of thought during the whole Sermon. That Sermon is not textual, of which one familiar with the Scriptures could hear a whole sub-division, or read a whole page, and still remain in uncertainty as to what text it was based upon.

As to *being related to the text*, (text verwandtschaft,) I mean by that not only, that sermons on texts of the Old and New Testaments, on the Gospel or the Epistle, on prose or poetic texts, should have their own and peculiar coloring, although it may also be in place to remind of that.

It is hard to comprehend how one could preach of the glory of the Evangelical Church on a text taken from Isaiah, or point out the requisites of the evangelical justification of faith, in the writings of Moses. I regard that as a confounding of the Old and New Testaments. If any one should appeal to the saying of Augustíne: *N. T. latet in Vetere. Vetus patet in Novo*, I would answer: True, indeed, but not *Novum T. patet in Vetere*. But this text relationship means more, namely: that we do not shun the highly important and fine mental labor to work ourselves into the whole spirit and meaning of the individual writer, and place ourselves into a relationship with him, that we do not only interpret his word to the congregation in his own mind, but may also be enabled to let his soul speak with additional testimony. The Sermon must not remain behind the sciences, and in our day, when we have learned to distinguish between the doctrinal conception of a Paul, a Peter, a John, and that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Sermons, that are in general biblical, are not sufficient. With all the essential unity of The Holy Scriptures, he who would preach in a Pauline spirit, on a text taken from the Epistle of James, would manifest that he had taken a wrong text. I go still further. Every Epistle of the Apostle Paul has its own peculiar character, that must have its expression in the sermon. On a text from the Epistle to the Galatians, although that may have its isolated tender passages, I cannot preach with the same heartiness and love, the same joyful emotion, that I can upon a text taken from the Epistle to the Philippians. It is on this account, that many sermons are useless and ineffective, not as Sulze thinks, because they are based on passages of Scripture, but because they are delivered in a distorted Scriptural language; it is not the language of David, not that of Isaiah, not that of the Synoptics, not that of John; it has ceased to be Bible language, because it is not individually biblical. So far as the synoptic Gospels are concerned, I cannot say, that I believe the peculiarity of the individual Evangelist to be lost, and, therefore, not to be noticed in the pulpit. In Lent Sermons, I consider it a falsification and a distorting of the Bible text, if, instead of taking the words of the history of Christ's sufferings, as given by Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John, as a foundation, one would take his text out of the first best Gospel Harmony, and, for instance, would preach on the

exclamation of the Centurion under the Cross, in the given words: "Truly this was a good man and the Son of God." That would be no Bible text at all, and the same is true of so many compilations. I either preach, according to Matthew (27 : 54,) on: "Truly this was the Son of God," or according to Mark (15 : 39,) on: "Truly this man was the Son of God," or according to Luke (23 : 47,) on: "Certainly this was a righteous man." Each of these three texts, gives for three years different sermons, in which the same truth, as it is differently reflected in the soul of the individual evangelist, appears with different shades of meaning. In the first sermon, upon the reading according to the peculiarity of Matthew, that particular which places the universality of the Gospel and the advantage of the heathen in a prominent light, were to be especially noticed, which can be done in reference to the fact, that the *heathen* centurion, and those with him, acknowledged him who was crucified by the Jews as the Son of God. The second Sermon should then, according to the peculiarity of Mark which is mirrored forth in the addition ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκώς ἐξ ἰναρτίας αὐτοῖ, give a dramatic representation of the occurrence, and the powerful contrast between a mere man and the Son of God, as it becomes prominent in the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the accompanying miracles that make such deep impression upon the centurion, to which the especial attention is to be directed. And the third Sermon would extol the righteousness of God which honors suffering innocence, according to that peculiarity of Luke, who has the expression εἰδόξασεν added to the text verse. There would be other themes that could be drawn from this text of Luke, e. g. The pious human part (*Das fromme Menschliche*), in the death of Jesus,—in consideration of the fact, that Luke gives the genealogy of Christ, and refers it back to the first man, and through him to God, in order to exhibit Jesus as the second Adam, and, also, that Luke alone gives more accurate accounts of the childhood of Jesus; or, "How the glorification of Jesus, as the good man, gives us a powerful impression, that we are sinful beings." For Luke is the Evangelist, who alone has the addition: "they smote their breasts and returned," (48,) and who also alone has the account of the miraculous draught of fishes, (5 : 1—11,) with the characteristic confession of Peter: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." What,

then, I want to say, is this: the physiognomy of that Evangelist who has given us the text, should be recognizable in our Sermon. The most general departure from this text relationship, that can be allowed, is in the case of those sententious passages, for whose general truth it is of no importance, or at least, of a subordinate importance, through whom the Holy Ghost uttered them; the least allowable is with Sermons on a whole book of the Bible, in its connected relation. Whoever undertakes to preach on the Gospel of John, and has not lain on Jesus' breast, or on the Revelation of John, and has not been in the Spirit of the Lord on the the Lord's Day, lacks the necessary fitness for such Sermons. But, if any one should ask, whether this *text relationship* of the Sermon should go so far as to preach an obscure Sermon on an obscure text, I would prefer to let Augustine give the answer to this question. He says: "No. For the interpreters of Scripture must not speak as though they undertook to express themselves in such a way as to give the appearance, that they need to be explained again, but they should above all things labor, that they may be understood in all their speaking, so far as that can be done by means of a plain exhibition of the truth, so that, he who does not understand it, is either of a very weak mind, or that the difficulty, lies rather in the depth and subtily of the subject to be explained, than that which we speak is less understood, or with more difficulty."

I now come to the duty of the preacher to *exhaust* his text. Only a relative exhausting of the text is, of course, possible, according to our ability, and the special object of the Sermon; an absolute exhausting of the text would necessitate every following Sermon on the same text, to be a mere repetition. But, not only the Bible as a whole, but also, every single text, is like unto the starry sky; the longer we look into it, the more stars become visible to us. If the Sermon is made with a living reference to present circumstances, and if the preacher grows from year to year, in wisdom and grace, he will, in repeating an exhaustive Sermon on the same text, be like unto the household-er "who bringeth forth, out of his treasury, things new and old," and be secure against the digression, that allows the theme and its development to occupy itself with extraneous matters, and not reach the case. I regard the

Sermons of Rud. Stier as models, with reference to *exhausting* the text. We should always look upon the text before us, as though we had never preached on it before, and as though we never intended to preach on it again. To this part also, belongs the question, whether it be allowable to place more than one text at the foundation of one and the same sermon. I regard this as questionable, on the ground that, in that case, no one text can be treated exhaustively. It also occurs, that where two texts are combined, they are placed in a false light, and, that their signification, which they had in their original connection, is altered. If, for example, the account of our Lord's temptation should be combined with a second text, as James 1 : 14, "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed," it would be nothing less than blasphemy. It is, however, not out of place to cite, or read whole passages of Scripture, besides the regular text, at suitable points during the Sermon, as Bengel did at times, "because one must not pre-suppose as much knowledge of Scripture with the people, as is generally done, and Bible passages are the best and most edifying to the sincere hearer, who seeks salvation." In such a procedure, which, also, Draeseke followed at times, we disavow, from the start, any exhaustive treatment of those extra texts.

The next step, which the Sermon, in its relation to the text, can take, I have designated by the requirement, that it must *control* the text. The more a preacher has allowed his meditation to be controlled by the text, the more will the text in mental reproduction become his own free property, which, far from binding him, becomes a sword of the Spirit in his mouth, and a balm in his hand. The preacher, who has mastered his text, is not a slave to his textual disposition, but all things are at his disposal, be it Paul or Apollos, be it Cephas or the world, be it life or death, be it things present or things to come. The striking and fitting application of the text to the times, its culture and pretences, to the Church and school, to the church year, to the congregation and its circumstances, will all offer itself unsought, to the preacher, who has mastered his text. On the most general text he can preach in a very special manner, and on the most special text he can preach in a very general manner; he is far from tedious and tiresome repetitions, and yet true to the principle of A. H.

Francke: "Every Sermon should have, at least, so much of the way of salvation in it, that if one should hear only this single sermon, it would be enough to lead him to salvation." Not independence of the text, as the preaching of our times strives to become, but being freed by the text—let that be our aim, in order that we, as those who are free indeed, can also set others free from the law of sin and death, and, as those built upon the right foundation, can also build others up in Jesus Christ. Homiletical arts and rules are scarcely needed in order to edify our generation, but there must be something of the Spirit manifest in the Sermon, which cannot be achieved without much mental labor and prayer. This mastery of the text considered with unction: The sermon itself becomes a *textus sacer*, or as Novalis says: "A fraction of the Bible, and, that even of the canonical part of the Bible, producing inspiration," and we may cease to preach, and leave the further work to the Holy Ghost. To reach this ideal of the Sermon's relation to the text, that is, the object to be aimed at; and the older we become, and the oftener we have preached, and heard the call again and again, *Preach*, the more we realize how far we are from the true standard; I, for my own part conclude, with the confession of Jeremiah: "O, Lord, Lord, I am not fit to preach, for I am too young."

ARTICLE VII.

PATRICK HENRY.*

By W. B. SPRAGUE, D. D., LL. D., Albany, N. Y.

It is a signal proof of the wisdom of Providence, that whenever there is a great end to be accomplished, the fitting instruments are always at hand. I know not where to look for a more striking illustration of this remark, than is furnished by the history of that great national struggle, that gave us our independence. It was, indeed, a mighty

* Delivered by the author on several occasions, and, at the request of the Editor, presented to the readers of the *Evangelical Review*.

end, that was to be accomplished : it was not merely, that a tyrant's arm was to be resisted, or, that a nation's freedom was to be established, but there was to be a noble example set, that should tell through all future ages upon the destinies of the world. And, when the fulness of time for this great event had come, there was found a race of giants in the land—men who were every way qualified, not only to project a mighty enterprise, but to conduct it to a favorable issue. How far they were originally constituted great with reference to the exigency they were destined to meet, and how far they became great through the influences of the circumstances in which they were placed, it is not necessary now to inquire ; but, as to the fact, that they towered above the men of almost any other period, in respect to wisdom and valor and might, there is no room for question. In a few years they accomplished more for the civil regeneration of the race, than had been accomplished by the whole world during the lapse of centuries. Their history is the history of lofty purposes and noble deeds. Their names are as imperishable as the result of their labors is glorious.

Of these great spirits, one of the greatest, in some respects, the very greatest was PATRICK HENRY. I purpose to present some brief sketches of his character ; but brief they must necessarily be, to be included within the space allotted to me. His public life was one of almost incessant occupation ; and if you would have a minute detail of the events by which it was marked, you can consult his eloquent biographers. All that I shall attempt will be to hold him up in two or three different characters, selecting facts to illustrate them, here and there from the history of his life. For most of the incidents that I shall state, I shall rely on the authority of Wirt : though a portion of them have been gathered from other sources, especially from one of the most venerable and eminent clergymen in this country, now deceased, who was personally acquainted with Henry, and for some time exercised his ministry in his immediate neighborhood.

Let me speak of Patrick Henry then, in the first place, as a *self-made man*. In most cases, where men attain to great eminence by their unassisted efforts, it is not difficult to find some decided prognostics of this in their early tastes and habits. But, if such prognostics existed in the case of Henry, they were at least so remote and obscure as

to have escaped general observation. A glance at his early life will sufficiently illustrate this remark.

He was born of respectable, but not opulent parents, in the year 1736; his father having emigrated from Scotland to Virginia, some five or six years before. The vocation of his father was, temporarily at least, that of a schoolmaster; and it was from him, that Patrick learned the elements of grammar and mathematics. But he is represented, as having been at that period, an excessively idle and unpromising boy, manifesting a strong aversion to books, and seeking his enjoyment chiefly in rural sports and solitary rambles. As he evinced no desire for a liberal education, his father placed him, at the age of about fifteen, in a neighboring counting house, with a view to his engaging in mercantile pursuits; and, after a year's apprenticeship, he and his brother, who was even more indolent than himself, formed a partnership, and commenced business for themselves. Being kept now in a great measure from his accustomed sports in the field, he resorted for amusement to his violin; and soon became as passionately devoted to this, as he had been to the other. The affairs of the firm, as might have been anticipated, went badly enough; and, at the end of the year, the concern was given up as an utter failure. Having now, at the age of eighteen, formed a matrimonial connection with a farmer's daughter in the neighborhood, in moderate circumstances, he resolved on trying his hand at farming; and, accordingly, the new married couple settled down on a small patch of ground, that had been provided for them, assisted by one or two slaves, intending literally to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. But it turned out, that Henry had not more skill as a farmer than a merchant; and, after the experiment of a year, he sold his property at considerable loss, and again found himself without any stated employment. As, however, it was absolutely necessary, that he should do something for the support of his family, he resolved to make one more trial at mercantile life; and, accordingly, he purchased a few goods, and became again the master of a little establishment. But, as there had been no change in the mode of conducting business, it was not strange, that substantially the same result should have been realized—within two years he was obliged to give up the concern in utter bankruptcy. After having had such a measure of disappointment meted out to him, it would

have been no marvel, if he had sunk irrecoverably under it; but, it was just at this point, that the energy of his spirit began to awake; and, though he had yet no adequate idea of his own powers, he felt the necessity of exertion in *some* way, and he resolved upon the study of the Law. After having pursued this study a few months, or as some say, only a single month, he offered himself a candidate for admission to the bar; and, after an examination, which, in some respects, he sustained very imperfectly, he succeeded in obtaining his license. Up to the period of his commencing the study of the Law, at least, one would be ready to imagine, that there was little that betokened self-culture, even in the lowest degree—on the contrary, it would rather have appeared, that he was training himself to be a burden to society; but we shall see, as we advance, that even amidst all these apparently untoward indications, a process was going forward in the silent workings of the spirit, which was to result in a degree of intellectual development, which should be the wonder of the world.

It must be acknowledged, that in one respect, Patrick Henry had greatly the advantage of most other self-made men—his Creator had supplied him with better materials to work upon, in a mind so pre-eminently fertile and original, that it threw even most other great minds into the shade. There are those, who will have it, that all the diversities of intellectual character that exist among men, are to be referred to the influence of circumstances; and, that Heaven bestows her gifts originally with an equal hand. But the least observation upon human character, brands this notion as an idle dream—there is not a greater original diversity in the human countenance, than in the human mind—the man whom we are contemplating, if he had lived and died in the deepest obscurity, would have still been originally and essentially a great man: the elements of might and majesty would have been in his soul, however he might himself have been unconscious of them to his dying day. Had he received from his Creator, nothing more than ordinary intellectual gifts, a diligent course of self-culture, might have rendered him not only respectable and useful, but even eminent; but no amount of effort could have ever made him what he was, if he had not been among the most eminently favored in his intellectual constitution.

If we look a little more narrowly into his early history,

we shall, if I mistake not, easily detect the process of self training, by which his faculties became so wonderfully developed. In the apparently idle boy, in the shop-keeper in love with his violin, in the farmer trudging about upon his stinted patch, in the youthful bankrupt, rushing, as if in desperation, into the profession of the Law, when he had scarcely had time to master the elements of the science—in all these various characters we shall find, that the germ of his subsequent greatness was silently developing itself; and *that* in several different ways.

He appears, for instance, from his earliest childhood, to have been remarkable for a habit of observation. Notwithstanding, he had an utter aversion to books, he was a most diligent observer of men. He was fond of being present where several individuals were carrying on an animated conversation—no matter what the subject might be; and though he would sit in silence, and seem scarcely to notice what was said, yet it would subsequently be found, that not a word had escaped him, and, that he could relate the whole, with perfect accuracy. And the same disposition was evinced, still more strikingly at a later period, especially while he was trying his fortune as a merchant. He was constantly making experiments, with a view to ascertain the character of his customers. He not only noted particularly whatever they might say, in ordinary intercourse, but he took special pains to give such a direction to their conversation, as would be most likely to elicit their peculiarities of character. He would relate anecdotes, not unfrequently, that were apocryphal and of his own originating; and would sometimes personate different characters, and make sham speeches, for no other purpose than that he might observe the effect produced upon his auditors, as it was manifested not only through their lips, but by their countenances. In all this, it is not to be supposed, that he had the slightest idea of cultivating his own powers, with reference to a future, glorious destiny—it was really nothing more than obedience to a strong instinctive impulse;—but, after all, it was the means which Providence was using to reveal the giant to himself, and ultimately to reveal him in all his strength and majesty to the world.

In this habit of close observation, which was maintained in all circumstances, and even amidst the development of some apparently untoward dispositions, lay, to a great ex-

tent, the secret of his ultimate eminence; for it was his ability to read the character of men under every variety of influence, that made him so continually sought for, not only as a legal advocate, but a councillor in the higher concerns of state, and, that rendered him through life, more than almost any other man, the terror of his adversaries. Indeed, this kind of knowledge always gives a man more power over his fellow men, than any other; and, though, like every thing else, it is capable of being perverted, and often is perverted to the basest purposes, yet, in its legitimate application, it ministers most effectually to the noblest interests of men. It is a kind of knowledge, which, in its higher degrees, is not to be gained from books—the volume chiefly to be studied, is the heart itself, either as it lies shut up in one's own bosom, or as it is revealed in the tenor of the life. Whosoever will, may come to this fountain of knowledge, and drink freely; and whosoever avails himself of this privilege, as he may, even though he be an exile from the world of letters, will be sure to have no mean intellectual growth; and, if circumstances should ever furnish the opportunity, marvel not if he shows himself a great man.

Notwithstanding, Henry, in his earliest years, manifested a strong aversion to books, that aversion seems to have been gradually overcome, as he approached his maturity; and, we find him, even during the period of his mercantile and agricultural life, occupying portions of his leisure in reading translations of some of the Greek and Latin classics. His favorite author, seems to have been Livy; and, so enamoured was he with that noble history, that he is said to have read it through attentively once a year, for many successive years; and, some have imagined, that to this circumstance, were to be referred those noble traits of Roman character, for which, in after life, he was so much distinguished. But the point to which I wish more particularly to advert, is, that his reading, if not very abundant, was very select, and, that he never laid aside a book, until he had become thoroughly possessed of every thing valuable that it contained. It is the prevalence of a spirit the opposite to this—the rage for light and superficial reading—that gives to the present age, in many respects, a dwarfish and sickly intellectual character.

But any view of the progress, by which the mind of this great man was trained, would be very imperfect, that should

not involve the influence of circumstances; for, notwithstanding he was a self-made man, his own efforts were, in a great measure, both dictated and aided by the peculiar situations, in which he was placed. His occupation as a store keeper furnished a fine opportunity for him to make observations upon character—a habit so essentially identified with all his greatness. His ill success as a farmer and a merchant, in connection with the necessity of providing for a rising family, gave him the first impulse towards the Law—the profession in which he was destined to earn some of his brightest laurels. And then, again, the peculiar condition of the country, making ready to resist the arm of the oppressor, and to stand before the world in the dignity of acknowledged independence, was just what was necessary to bring out those qualities, which are essential to the highest statesmanship. How far his character might have been varied by having been developed under different circumstances, it is impossible to decide; but it is easy to see, that the circumstances in which he was actually placed, even those which seemed the most inauspicious, were providentially arranged with admirable reference to what he was to be, and what he was to do, during an eventful life.

Having exhibited him as a self-made man, let me ask you to contemplate him next as a *matchless orator*. That he really *was* one of the greatest orators of modern times, is put beyond all question, not only by general tradition, but by the testimony of individuals very recently deceased, who listened to him, and were perfectly competent judges of his eloquence. Jefferson, who was long his contemporary and associate in public life, and who, from the circumstances in which he was placed, must have been familiar with the finest models of eloquence, both at the bar and in the senate house, has declared not only, that he was the first orator to whom he ever listened, the first orator of the time in which he lived, but the first which the world ever saw. Admitting even that this opinion savors somewhat of extravagance, yet, the very fact, that such an opinion could have been expressed by such a man, is proof enough of the superlative greatness of the powers that called it forth. The history of his eloquence, is incorporated with the history of his country—it is to be found, not merely on those pages which directly describe the orator's

power, as evinced by the effect which he produced, but in those institutions which had their origin in measures which he was among the first to suggest, or defend.

In a conversation with the venerable clergyman, to whom I referred, as having furnished me with some interesting details of Henry's life, I received from him an account of the effect which his eloquence produced upon his own mind, on the trial of three men charged with the crime of murder. He stated, that that was the only time, that he ever heard him address a jury; that it was nearly night, when the time for the opening of the trial came; and, that it became a question with the court, whether it should not be deferred till the next day. Henry, who was engaged for the defence, rose and said with the utmost simplicity and solemnity of manner, that as the business to which they were next to proceed, was the most important which they could be called to transact on earth, involving the question, whether the probation of three human beings should, or should not, be continued, and, as he should not be able to finish the defence that evening, and for some other reasons also, should speak at a disadvantage, he thought it was due to the magnitude of the interests involved, that the trial should be put off till the next morning. The effect which this simple statement produced on the mind of my informant, may be seen from the following extract of a letter which he afterwards wrote me, in compliance with a request, that he would furnish me with some of his recollections of that extraordinary man. I shall make no apology for the length of the extract, as it contains the opinion concerning his eloquence of a most competent judge, and one of the most distinguished of our American clergymen.

In referring to the trial of which he had before given me some account, he writes: "I was told, that he did not exert his power over the passions, to the extent that he commonly did on similar occasions; and the reason assigned by a very judicious man who knew him well, was, that he was aware, that every man in the community was on his guard against this blinding influence. I am not able to express on paper, the impression I received of his sincerity, when he first rose to speak; and, that was the point which, above all others, I was solicitous to ascertain. My conviction, that every word which he spoke, was from the bottom of his heart, deeply impressed with.

the weight of his cause, was instantaneous and perfect. And I never entertained a doubt afterwards, that he entered so deeply into the feelings of his clients, and sympathized so perfectly with them, that all the emotion he ever manifested was real; and on this evident, earnest sincerity, his power over a jury greatly depended. There was never any appearance of artifice about the man. He was uniformly serious, and seemed to enter simply, and with all his soul, into the business in which he was engaged. He undoubtedly possessed an insight into the human heart that was peculiar, and a power so to fill the mind of his hearers with his own ideas, that every thing else was, for the time, obliterated from the mind. A judicious friend of mine, who heard him defend a criminal in New London, Virginia, informed me, that when the State's Attorney had finished his speech, and had descanted on the evidence, everything appeared so plain, that he could not conceive what could be said with the smallest plausibility on the other side; and he waited with curiosity to hear what Henry would reply. Instead of attacking the arguments of the Attorney General, he went off in a beautiful and striking description of something, which had only a remote connection with the subject, until he had expelled from the minds of his hearers every vestige of proof, which had been advanced. And, when he had, by this means, completely erased the impression made by the former speech, he made his own statement—coming to the point, however, by degrees, and after, by various hints and innuendoes, he had prepared the jury to receive his statements.

The power of the orator to possess the minds of his hearers so completely with his own thoughts, to the exclusion, for the time, of all others, was a faculty far more important than the ability to move the passions of his hearers; and, by this, he influenced the minds of the intelligent and well informed, as much as the vulgar. I experienced something of this in the trial which I attended. The proof of the murder was positive, and the principal witness was one Harvey, a large, likely man, and of reputable character. In the course of the evidence, various circumstances respecting the man, which were merely incidental, were brought to view. Out of these hints, the orator formed a fictitious character of the man, and made so great a matter of little circumstances, and pointed his long crooked finger so often at him, and looked upon him

with such ineffable contempt, that before he had finished, I felt the conviction arising in my mind, that not the smallest credit was due to the testimony of that man. But this conviction vanished, as soon as I had the opportunity of reflection. Another instance of this kind I will mention, which I received from General Thomas Posey, a personal friend of Washington—a man of great dignity, and and sound, cool judgment. He was a decided friend of the Federal Constitution, the merits of which, were then under discussion in the Virginia Convention. He was not a member; but being in Richmond to bear the debates, he was present when Henry made his great speech, an account of which, you have in Wirt. Though not a man susceptible of strong impressions; and usually very fixed in his opinions, yet, he told me, when he returned home, that, while Henry was speaking, he was as fully convinced, as he ever was of anything, that if the constitution was adopted, the country was ruined.

If you ask for the secret of this power, I can only say, that Henry's emotions were vivid, to an unusual degree; and he possessed a power of expressing emotion, which no other man that I ever heard possessed. When in a high state of excitement, his tones, his gestures, his looks, his attitudes, his pauses, were all inimitable; and yet, they were understood and felt by every hearer. In the course of the evidence, on the trial to which I have referred, it was testified, that Harvey had said, in answer to a challenge—I can whip you, in a moment, you vile scoundrel. These words he repeated over and over again, using the identical words of the witness; but in a tone and manner expressive of the strongest anger. I often attempted, afterwards, to imitate his tone, but found that I could not approximate towards it. If he could have commanded a verdict immediately after speaking, before there was time for reflection, he must have gained every cause." Thus far my informant.

There were various occasions in Henry's life, on which he exerted his remarkable powers, with an effect, that would seem almost incredible. The time will permit me to advert to only two of his celebrated speeches, the one, evincing his powers as a lawyer, the other, his power as a statesman.

The former, was his well known speech in the cause which has always been familiarly known in Virginia, as *the parson's cause*. As the history of this affair may not

be familiar to all, a few words of explanation may be necessary to render the case intelligible, and to make one appreciate Henry's great effort. At this period the Episcopal form of worship was established by law in Virginia, as it is in Great Britain, at this day. By a statute of the colony, originally passed in 1696, and re-enacted in 1748, the salary of each parish minister was placed at sixteen thousand pounds of tobacco; which he might demand in the article itself, or might receive in any other way that should suit his convenience. The market price of tobacco, for a long time, remained stationary at sixteen shillings and eight pence the hundred; and, the clergy were in the habit of receiving their salary in a money payment, calculated on this basis.

In 1755, in consequence of a partial failure of the crop of tobacco, the price of the article suddenly increased about fourfold; and the Legislature, in order to secure the planters against great loss, passed a law, authorizing them to pay in money such of their debts as were due in tobacco, at the same rate, at which the article had been held in preceding years. The law went immediately into effect, and continued in force for ten months, without the usual clause suspending its operation, till it should receive the royal assent; and, during this period, it is not known that any of the clergy objected to it. Three years after, in 1758, in anticipation of another light crop of tobacco, the Legislature re-enacted the law of 1755, omitting, as before, any recognition of the royal authority. At this, the clergy took the alarm; and a vigorous pamphlet warfare was commenced, in which, were enlisted some of the ablest pens in the colony; the clergy maintaining, that the colonial laws were not valid, without the royal assent, and, therefore, they retained all the rights vested in them by the act of 1748; and, the planters urged the injustice of attempting to extort from them, in a time of scarcity, three or four times the amount, which even the statute to which they appealed, as having fixed their salary, had ever contemplated. The affair having been brought before the king in council, it was decided, that the act of 1758, for want of the royal assent, was not valid; and, immediately upon this, the clergy undertook to enforce their alleged claims by legal process. The first action that was brought, and that which furnished Henry the opportunity of immortalizing himself, was by the Rev. James Maury; though

this was quickly followed by many others, which, however, after the result of the first, were all withdrawn.

In this case of Maury, the plaintiff pleaded the statute of 1748, and the defendant that of 1758; but the plaintiff, in reply to the defendant, maintained, that this latter act, could in no wise effect the plaintiff's claim, inasmuch as it had not only never received the royal sanction, but had actually been declared null and void by the king in council. The legal question, which was argued at the November Term of 1763, was decided in favor of the clergy; and it only remained for the jury to give the damages; which was regarded as little more than a mere matter of form, as the amount was supposed to be decided by the statute of 1748. With a view to this, the action was continued; and Mr. Lewis, who had hitherto managed the cause for the defendants, having retired, considering that it was already actually brought to a close, Henry was retained as counsel, with a view to argue the question of damages before the jury.

The day for the trial at length arrived—it was the first day of December, 1763; and rarely has there ever been an array of circumstances better fitted to embarrass and intimidate a young lawyer, than existed in connection with this occasion, in reference to Henry. He was then but twenty-seven years of age, and until then, his voice had never been heard in open Court. The case was one, that had excited the strongest interest throughout the colony; and even at that late stage of the proceedings, when the question was generally regarded as virtually settled in favor of the clergy, an immense throng had assembled to hear the final issue. Henry's own father was the presiding magistrate of the Court. A large number of the clergy were present, perfectly confident of the complete and ultimate triumph of their cause. Among those who came, was the Rev. Patrick Henry, an uncle of the orator, who, had himself, an action then pending, similar to that which was then finally to be decided. Wirt relates the following anecdote, in reference to the meeting, which took place between Henry and his uncle at the Court House. Henry approached his uncle, expressing his regret at seeing him there. "Why so,"—inquired the uncle. "Because," replied Henry, "I fear, that as I have never yet spoken in public, I shall be too much overawed by your presence, to do justice to my clients." "Besides," he add-

ed, "I shall be under the necessity of saying some hard things of the clergy, which it may be unpleasant to you to hear." His uncle now censured him for having undertaken the case on the side of the planters; which Henry excused by saying: "That he had no offer from the clergy; and, that independently of this, his own heart and judgment were on the side of the people." He then requested his uncle to leave the ground. "Why, Patrick," said the old gentleman, with a good natured smile, "as to your saying hard things of the clergy, I advise you to be cautious, as you will be more likely to injure your own cause than theirs. As to my leaving the ground, I fear, my boy, that with such a case to defend, my presence will do you but little harm or good. Since, however, you seem to think otherwise, and desire it of me so earnestly, you shall be gratified." He then entered his carriage, and returned home.

Shortly after the opening of the Court, the cause was called; when Mr. Lyons, the counsel for the plaintiff, introduced it by a short speech, the object of which, was to show that, as the previous decision of the Court had set aside the act of 1758, nothing remained but that they should regulate the amount of damages by the act of 1748; and, having done this, and then dealt out some very fulsome compliments upon the clergy, he took his seat. Henry rose to reply—little dreaming, that the speech he was about to make, was to stamp his character as an orator, with the seal of immortality. His personal appearance was awkward, forbidding, clownish; and the first few sentences that he uttered, gave promise of nothing but utter failure. His father, the presiding officer whom he had to address, showed evident signs of extreme mortification; his friends around him, and the friends of the cause which he had undertaken to defend, hung their heads in anticipation of a disastrous result; while the clergy and those who favored their claims, were observed to brighten up with exultation, and to exchange significant nods, in the full confidence that a complete triumph awaited them. But not many minutes had passed, before the disheartened and the triumphant began to exchange places. Henry's stammering was cured by the time that he had finished his exordium; and, he who had just stood before them, with apparently all the attributes of a clown, was transformed, as if by magic, into the most eloquent orator, to

whom they had ever listened. The account of the scene, from those who were witnesses, would seem scarcely to be within the limits of credibility; and yet, so many competent judges have concurred in it, that all must concede, that it was one of the most extraordinary efforts in the history of forensic eloquence. The countenance of the orator became radiant with an almost superhuman illumination; the awkward form stood erect with the utmost grace and manliness; the gestures characterized alike by simplicity and majesty, were evidently in harmony with the mighty movements of the soul; the eye was like the lightning's flash; the voice now entranced by its melody, and now overawed by its power. Nor was the speech less distinguished for its matter than its manner: the argument was lucid, powerful, irresistible: the appeals to the passions were such, as none but a perfect master could have safely attempted; and the effect was, that both the intellect and the heart were carried by storm. The audience were thrown into a sort of phrenzy of admiration. The immense crowd, occupying not only every particle of room in the court house, even to the window seats, but also the passage into the house, and the space around the door, were bending forward and gazing with astonishment at the orator, as if they were contemplating the features, and listening to the voice of a being from some brighter world. Before he had proceeded far in his speech, the clergy made their way through the crowd out of the house; indignant at the torrent of eloquent, burning invective, that was poured out upon them, and disappointed and mortified in the certain prospect of their defeat. As soon as the argument was closed, the jury, without leaving their seats, returned a verdict of one penny damages; and, though a motion was immediately made for a new trial, the court overruled it; both the court and the jury being well nigh bewildered by the scene that had been passing. Notwithstanding the most vigorous attempts of the Sheriff and his assistants to preserve order, Henry was actually taken up by the multitude, and carried on their shoulders, out of the house and around the yard, as the highest expression of gratitude, admiration and triumph; and, it was some time, before even his own earnest expostulations availed to his being set at liberty. The result of this trial put an end to the general controversy, to which it related; and though many other of the clergy had actually commenced

similar prosecutions, they were almost immediately withdrawn, their case having been rendered, by this extraordinary effort, absolutely hopeless. Notwithstanding this was Henry's first appearance as an advocate, and though it was the beginning of a glorious and somewhat protracted career, as a lawyer, it may reasonably be doubted, whether he ever exceeded this first effort, perhaps even whether he ever quite reached it, in any subsequent effort of his brilliant course.

We have seen what he was at the bar—let us now contemplate him as a parliamentary orator: and, here again, we can select but a single example or two, to illustrate his admirable powers. Let me refer you to his celebrated speech before the General Assembly of Virginia, occasioned by the Stamp Act.

Notwithstanding, at the close of the old French war, in 1763, the state of feeling in the American Colonies towards the mother country, was, perhaps, more loyal and specific, than it had been at almost any other period, yet, it was not long before an oppressive spirit, on the part of Great Britain, began to discover itself; and, the celebrated Stamp Act, which had been preceded by a declaratory resolution at a previous session of Parliament, and was actually passed in the year 1765, roused, in the Colonies a sense of injury, a spirit of indignation, that ere long developed itself in open resistance. Virginia, in connection with Massachusetts, had the honor of taking the lead in the glorious struggle; and, Henry was the man fixed upon by the Old Dominion, to ride in the approaching whirlwind, and direct the gathering storm. He was, accordingly, chosen a member of the House of Burgesses, for the year 1765; and when he came to take his seat in an assembly, in which were the Pendletons, the Lees, the Randolphs, and many others of the most accomplished and elegant men of the day, his coarse and slovenly appearance, formed rather a striking contrast with their cultivated and courtly manners; but, as his powers, as a public speaker, had already been tried and proved, no misgiving was felt on account of his forbidding exterior. It was soon discovered, that Henry's notions of resistance to oppression, were greatly in advance of those of nearly all who constituted the Assembly; the great mass thinking, that it was better to wait for some more decisive action on the part of the Crown, before pro-

ceeding to any decisive measures, while *he* believed, that the time for open resistance had already come. This diversity of opinion gave rise to a debate of great length and powerful eloquence; in which, Henry figured with matchless energy and brilliancy. Finding, that none of the older members were likely to introduce anything that came up to his views of the necessity of the case, he, at length, brought forward his celebrated resolutions, utterly denying the right of Great Britain to tax the Colonies, and declaring every attempt to do this, adapted to destroy, not only American, but British freedom. The resolutions met with the most violent opposition, and the projector of them was grossly abused, and even threatened by the party in favor of submission; but such was the power of his eloquence, that the opposition so far melted away, that when, after a protracted discussion, the vote came to be taken, there was found a majority in favor of the resolutions. Whether this was Henry's greatest parliamentary effort, we do not pretend to say; but it may safely be said, that no other ever imprinted itself more indelibly on the destinies of his country; for the news of the result flew with almost electric rapidity through all the Colonies, and awakened everywhere the spirit of resistance to British taxation; and this, as every one knows, led on to the war that gave us our independence. It is much to be regretted, that of the speech or speeches made by Henry on this occasion, no satisfactory record has been preserved; with the exception of a single passage designed to illustrate the danger, to which the king himself would be exposed, if he should persevere in his present course. "Cæsar," said he, "had his Brutus; Charles the First, his Cromwell; and George the Third"—here he paused, as if hesitating what to say; but it seemed so obvious, that he was about to intimate, that George the Third, too, might look out for a violent death, that the cry of "Treason, Treason," was set up by the members who were opposed to him. Henry, without manifesting the least embarrassment, but rising in still greater majesty, from the effort that was made to put him down, fastened his piercing eye upon the Speaker of the House, whose profligacy in the management of the public treasury, he had just before had occasion to expose, and added, with inimitable emphasis, as the closing words of the sentence—"may profit by their example." After another of his expressive pauses, and as a comment

upon the outrage, by which he had been interrupted, he subjoined, with a power perfectly electric, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

It would be easy to occupy, not merely a single hour, but several hours, in describing Henry's wonderful efforts of eloquence, as they were scattered along through his whole public life; but, for this, I must refer to his biography by Wirt; and I do it with the more alacrity, as it is not only one of the most instructive, but one of the most eloquent and fascinating works of the kind in the language. I trust, however, that enough has been said, to show that he was a very prince among orators. What Whitefield was in the pulpit, he was at the bar and in the senate house; with this difference, however, that *his* mind was incomparably more profound and penetrating. Whitefield's sermons, which, in the delivery, completely entranced his hearers, and caused them to look upon him as an almost unearthly personage, when they came from the press, even after having been subjected to his own correction, seem comparatively jejune and imbecile; and, we are left to infer, the wonderful power of the manner, from the wonderful lack of power in the matter. But not so with Henry. His manner was, indeed, the very highest type of public speaking; but it was *what* he uttered, not less than *how* he uttered it, that decided the character of his oratory. It is, of course, but an imperfect report of any of his speeches, that has come down to us; but imperfect, as it is, we can see a grandeur of conception, a grasp of intellect, an ability to grapple with giants, and to pierce the distant future, that have scarcely belonged to any other man. I have heard it suggested, that possibly he might have profited in respect to public speaking, by the opportunities he enjoyed in early life, of frequently listening to the celebrated President Davies, who resided in Henry's immediate neighborhood, and who is generally acknowledged to have been the first American pulpit orator of his day. But, however, this may have been, there is much reason to believe, that Henry himself had much to do, in forming the character of another pulpit orator, who is justly regarded as among Virginia's most illustrious sons—I mean Dr. Waddell—the blind clergyman, whom the biographer of Henry has done so much to immortalize in the *British Spy*. That man in his youth, often heard Henry speak; and though he was as far as possi-

ble from being an imitator, there is little doubt, that he insensibly imbibed from him some of those qualities, particularly that marvelous simplicity, in which the power of both Henry and Waddell seemed well nigh to be concentrated. Great credit is due to Wirt, for having contributed so much to illustrate the character of the Virginia orator; but, it may reasonably be doubted, whether any thing that ever has been, or ever will be written, concerning him, even approaches the idea of what he was, as it lies in the minds of those who have grown up on the immediate theatre of his fame, and amidst the traditions of his greatness.

There is one more aspect, in which we must view Patrick Henry, else we shall not only have a very incomplete view of his character, but shall have omitted that, in which his chief glory consisted—I mean, we must contemplate him as a *patriot*; for, if he had a ruling passion, it was his devotion to the interests of his country. To this, his ingenuity, his eloquence, his wonderful insight into the future, every gift that heaven had bestowed upon him, was rendered subservient. The history of his patriotism, would be the history of his whole public career; and the utmost that I can attempt in this hasty sketch, is to present before you, the most general synopsis of those public relations and acts, through which his patriotism displayed itself.

The love of liberty seems to have been deeply inwrought among the elements of his moral nature; and hence, we find, that he was among the first—some will have it, the very first—to conceive the idea of resistance to the arbitrary policy of the mother country. Certain it is, that while the multitude were thinking only of submission, and while even the brighter and bolder spirits were projecting only such measures of relief, as should consist with a continued subjection to the crown, the views of this immortal patriot reached farther: in his bosom had already sprung up the hope, that we should, ere long, be an independent people; and, that hope at no distant period, became a settled conviction; and, that conviction awoke all the enthusiasm of his soul, and nerved him for resolute and unceasing action. It is related of him, that in an incipient stage of the controversy, and before the thought of a permanent separation between the two countries had been broached, he was inquired of, by one of his friends, whether

he believed, that Great Britain would drive her colonies to extremities; and, if she should, what he thought would be the issue of the war. After looking around to see who were present, he expressed himself confidentially to the company, in the following manner: "She will drive us to extremities—no accommodation will take place—hostilities will *soon* commence; and a desperate and bloody touch it will be." "But," said his friend, "do you think, that an infant nation, as we are, without discipline, arms, ammunition, ships of war, or money to procure them,—do you think it possible, thus circumstanced, to oppose successfully the fleets and armies of Great Britain?" "I will be candid with you," replied Henry. "I doubt whether we shall be able *alone*, to cope with so powerful a nation." "But," continued he, rising from his chair with great animation, "where is France—where is Spain—where is Holland—the natural enemies of Great Britain! Where will they be all this while! Do you suppose that they will stand by, idle and indifferent spectators of the contest? Will Louis XVI, be asleep all this time? Believe me, No! When he shall become satisfied, by our serious opposition, and our declaration of independence, that all prospect of reconciliation is gone, then, and not till then, will he furnish us with arms, ammunition and clothing, and not with these only; but he will send his fleets and armies to fight our battles for us; he will form for us a treaty offensive and defensive, against our unnatural mother. Spain and Holland will join the confederation; our independence will be established, and we shall take our place among the nations of the earth." It is stated, that when he uttered the word *Independence*, the company seemed startled; as they had never heard anything of the kind before even suggested.

I have already had occasion in speaking of Henry as an orator, to notice the fact, that as early as 1764, he was elected a member of the Legislature of Virginia, and, as such, distinguished himself, by his inflexible opposition to British tyranny, and his incipient movements towards independence. He held this office by repeated re-election till 1774, when, in consequence of the enactment of the Boston Port Bill, or a bill by which the British government withdrew from the town of Boston, its privileges as a port of entry, the first general Congress was assembled at Philadelphia, and he was appointed one of the delegates to represent his native State. Early in the next year

(1775), we find him an active member of the Virginia Convention, and greatly in advance of the rest of the members in respect to the strength of the measures, which the exigency required; and just before the close of the session, he introduced resolutions in favor of immediate preparation for the military defence of the colony. The resolutions met with a vigorous opposition from most of the leading members of the Convention, on the ground, that the measure contemplated was premature; but, Henry's overpowering speech, which is regarded as among his highest efforts of eloquence, prevailed to the passage of the resolutions; and a committee was appointed, of which Henry and Washington were members, to prepare and report a plan for the organization of the militia.

At this point, we find Henry suddenly standing forth in a new character—that of a military man; and, such was the genius and prowess that he discovered, that if circumstances had not withdrawn him, soon after, from this kind of life, it is not improbable, that he might have figured among the most brilliant commanders of his time. As the indications of an ultimate resort to arms became more decisive, the Governors of the several Colonies resolved on an attempt to gain possession of the military stores, at the various, points at which they had been collected. In accordance with this determination, Lord Dunmore, then Governor of Virginia, caused about twenty barrels of powder to be conveyed by night from the magazine at Williamsburg, to an armed schooner, then lying in James river. The matter produced great excitement in the neighborhood the next morning; but, the Governor, when applied to by the municipal authorities, made some explanation, which so far satisfied them, that, for a time, the public tranquility was restored. In the county of Hanover, however, where Henry had fixed his residence, the voice of complaint was not so easily hushed; and, at a meeting of the inhabitants of that county, at which he was present, and made a most eloquent and exciting address, it was decided to march at once to Williamsburg, and either obtain payment for the powder, or compel the Governor to its restitution. A company of volunteers headed by Henry, forthwith proceeded on the expedition; and, the result was, that the king's Receiver General, gave a bill for the value of the property. The Governor immediately fortified his palace, and issued a proclamation, declaring Henry and his

co-adjutors guilty of a treasonable movement. But the voice of the whole surrounding country was raised in his favor; and meetings were held, applauding his conduct, and expressing a determination to protect him, at all hazards. There was, however, no attempt made to molest him; and, shortly after his return home, he proceeded to Philadelphia, to take his seat in Congress. With this session of Congress, closed his immediate connection with national politics; for, a series of events now occurred, which called for his service in a different capacity, and kept him, during the rest of his life, almost entirely within the limits of his native State.

The Governor, having, in consequence of some fresh demonstration of patriotic feeling in the city, withdrawn with his family, to reside on board a sloop of war, there was another meeting of the Virginia Convention, summoned by the House of Burgesses, to meet at Richmond, on the 24th of July. This body, assuming, that the Governor, by the course he had taken, had virtually abdicated his authority, proceeded to constitute a committee of safety, to represent in his absence, the executive branch of the government. A military organization of the Colony was, also, resolved upon, which provided, among other things, for the raising of two regiments of soldiers; and Henry was appointed not only Colonel of the first regiment, but Commander in Chief of all the forces that should be raised in Virginia. Considering his inexperience in military affairs, no higher compliment than this could have been paid to him; but the appointment seems to have given offence in certain quarters, and the result was, that after a series of events, which the time does not allow me to detail, and which occurred in a few months, he retired from military life altogether. He had evidently much reason to complain of injurious treatment in the matter; and a considerable portion of his soldiers resented so highly the injustice that had been done him, that they were just in the act of withdrawing from the service altogether; and it was only Henry's magnanimity in advising them, that finally determined them to remain. When it was known that he had tendered his resignation, the troops put on mourning, and presented to him an address, expressive of devoted attachment and boundless admiration.

As it devolved on the Colonies now to re-organize their political institutions on a new foundation, and as each Colo-

ny was regarded as having an inherent right to adopt any form of Government it might prefer, this right was exercised by means of popular conventions; and such a convention for Virginia, was held at Williamsburg on the 6th of May, 1776. Henry was a leading member of it, and was one of the committee that reported a declaration of rights and a plan of government, which were unanimously adopted. The new Constitution vested the executive power in a chief magistrate, with the title of Governor, to be annually elected by the Legislature, and to be eligible for three successive terms; and Henry was immediately designated to this office, the duties of which he discharged, of course, with the utmost ability and fidelity.

During the second year of Henry's administration, (for he was elected for three successive years,) occurred the memorable conspiracy against Washington, which involved many persons of distinction, both in Congress and in the army, and in which Gates and Conway are understood to have been the principal actors. It is impossible to enter into the details of this conspiracy, which, however, had no other effect upon the character of the Father of his country, than to surround it with additional glory; and I advert to it here, merely to say, that the part which Henry took in relation to it, was honorable alike to his patriotism and his friendship. An anonymous letter was addressed to him, designed to alienate his affections from Washington, and to enlist his influence to drive him from his post, as Commander in Chief of the army. Henry's clear mind instantly comprehended the nefarious design, and his noble spirit revolted at the idea of being invited to participate in it. He immediately enclosed the infamous letter to Washington, accompanied with an expression of regret, that there should be occasion to trouble him with so unworthy a communication, which, yet he did not feel himself at liberty to withhold; assuring him at the same time of the warm personal friendship which he felt for him, and his unabated confidence in both his ability and integrity.

As he became ineligible to the office of Governor, by the terms of the constitution, after three years, he was elected a member of the Assembly, where he continued to exercise a mighty influence to the close of his active life. One occasion, on which his eloquence was signally displayed, was the introduction of a resolution to permit those who had left the country during the Revolutionary

struggle, on account of their sympathy with the interests of Great Britain, to return to their old homes. This resolution was resisted with great eloquence, by some of the prominent members of the Assembly, particularly by Judge Tyler, father of the late President; and Henry was recklessly assailed, for his inconsistency, in having been so earnest in the cause of independence, and then so tolerant towards his country's enemies; but, he defended the resolution, not only on the principle of magnanimity, but from considerations of policy—maintaining, that population was what the country needed, and, that this was one of the most obvious ways of increasing it. His speech, on the occasion, which is said to have been one of his noblest efforts, availed to the passage of the resolution.

Passing over various measures of public utility, which were suggested by his wisdom, and carried by his eloquence, we find him, in 1786, elected one of the delegates of the convention for revising the articles of confederation among the States. This honorable commission, however, he felt himself constrained, from prudential and private considerations, to decline. But, when the result of this National Convention came to be submitted to the several States, he was elected a member of the Convention of Virginia, to decide upon the merits of the new Constitution; and, strange as it may seem, he stood forth with his matchless eloquence to oppose it. "He contended, that changes were dangerous to liberty; that, the old confederation had carried us through the war, and secured our independence; and, that, it might easily be amended to meet any exigency; that the proposed government, was a consolidated government, in which the sovereignty of the States would be lost, and all pretensions to rights and privileges, would be rendered insecure; that, the want of a bill of rights, was an essential defect; that, general warrants should have been prohibited; and, that to adopt the Constitution with a view to subsequent amendments, was only submitting to tyranny, in the hope of being, at some future time, liberated from it. He then offered a resolution, containing a bill of rights and amendments for the greater security of liberty and property, to be referred to the other States, before the ratification of the proposed form of government." Though he defended his views with the most fervid eloquence, and apparently, with a full conviction,

that the very existence of our national freedom depended on their being practically carried out, yet, there was an amount of influence on the other side, that prevailed against the passage of his resolution. His bill of rights and amendments, however, were afterwards accepted, and directed to be transmitted to the other States; and, some of these amendments, have been incorporated into the Federal Constitution. This was, perhaps, the only signal defeat, which Henry ever encountered during his whole public life; and, though some have questioned the purity of the motives, which dictated his course, there is every reason to believe, that he acted from deliberate and honest conviction. And, one of the best proofs of it, that he could have given, was, that he subsequently acquiesced in the Constitution, and gave it his earnest and active support. In an address, to the people, not long before his death, in connection with his offering himself as a candidate for the House of Delegates, he has this memorable passage: "The State has quitted the sphere in which she has been placed by the Constitution. What authority has the county of Charlotte, to dispute obedience to the laws of Virginia? And is not Virginia to the Union, what the county of Charlotte is to *her*? Opposition on the part of Virginia, to the acts of the Federal Government, *must* beget their enforcement by military power. This will produce civil war; civil war, foreign alliances; and, foreign alliances, must end in subjugation to the powers called in. Pause and consider. Rush not, I conjure you, into a condition, from which there is no retreat. You can never exchange the present government, but for a monarchy. If the administration have done wrong, let us all go wrong together, rather than to split into factions, which must destroy that *union* on which our existence hangs." What the departed patriot spake to the men of his time, he now repeats from his grave, to the men of our day; and wo, wo be to those, who refuse to hear and heed his admonitions!

If time allotted, I should delight to present this great man, in some other aspects; and, especially, to show how he advanced his more private relations. I should be obliged to admit, indeed, that as he was an heir to humanity, so he was not without its infirmities; but, I could still, with truth, present him as a fine example of whatever is lovely, and of good report in the intercourse of life. I

could show, from well authenticated facts, that he had a heart that beat quick to the tale of injustice, or oppression, or sorrow; that, he looked upon slavery as a curse, and deprecated the prospect of its continuance; that, he regarded Christianity, with the utmost reverence, and cheerfully contributed to sustain its institutions; and, looked to it, as his only refuge, when his flesh and heart were failing. I might dwell, too, upon the dignified cheerfulness, which he exhibited in the decline of life, and show how, even after bodily infirmities had clustered upon him, he was the life of every circle; how his company was coveted, even by little children, who admired his pleasantry, before they were able to appreciate his greatness. But, these, and various other points in his character, I must leave, and hasten this already too protracted train of remarks to a close.

But, I cannot close, without asking you to consider the design of Providence, in occasionally bringing forward such a noble specimen of human nature, as we have now been contemplating. Patrick Henry is now by universal consent, ranked among the giants of the race; there is a lustre about his name, that will, in all probability, endure, as long as the sun shines to rule the day. He had his particular mission; and, we can now see what it was—it was a mission of patriotism—a mission of good will to his country; and, in fulfilling it, he became pre-eminently one of his country's deliverers. Let us keep him in veneration for that, and teach our children to do so, after we are gone. But, let us profit by what he was, and what he did in another way—by viewing him as an illustrious specimen of man. It is from such examples, that we learn most effectually, the dignity of our nature. If, in this infancy of his existence, he was capable of such mighty efforts, what must be the strength of his faculties, what the measure of his intellectual greatness, in that higher state of being, on which he has now entered! True, he stood almost by himself; and, yet, there is not an individual, so insignificant, or obscure, but that he shares the same nature, and possesses, though in an inferior degree, the very same faculties with that illustrious man. Think as meanly and as penitently as thou wilt, of thine own perversion of the constitution which God has given thee; but, remember, that as it comes from His hands, it is a glorious constitution; and, what thou hast to do, is to cul-

tivate diligently, not only thine intellectual, but moral faculties, with a view to their more complete and everlasting development on the theatre of immortality.

Let me say, too, the glance which we have taken at the character and services of this wonderful man, ought to endear to us, the liberty and the institutions of our country. Henry's mind was only one of a host of illustrious minds, that produced the glorious result of our independence. We sit under our own vine, unmolested; but, the planting, and the rearing of this vine, cost sacrifices of which we do not dream—it was a work, that kept in requisition for years, minds and hearts, that constituted the brightest galaxy of the age; and, now the wisdom and valor of those great patriots and heroes still lingers, as an all pervading element in our noble institutions. Let us habituate ourselves to a consciousness of their presence, as if they were watching with earnest solicitude, over the goodly fabric which their hands have reared. Let us venerate their greatness; let us cherish their memories; let us embalm their fame—otherwise, we are not worthy to breathe this free air; to tread this earth, redeemed by blood, from the curse of tyranny. My country, I trust in God, that a glorious destiny awaits thee. I think I see thee, in the vista of ages, looming up into a nobler object than the sun now shines upon; but, believe me, thou wilt never realize this destiny, if thou shouldst be guilty of forgetting thy deliverers. But thou wilt not forget them; thou wilt associate them with everything that is great, with everything that is dear. Thy children's children, to the latest generation, shall study their history, till it becomes as a household word; shall reverence and imitate their virtues, and lay bright garlands upon their graves.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry. By James M. Hoppin, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Yale College. New York: Sheldon & Co. The volume discusses the subject of Preaching—its History and Art; the Analysis of a Sermon;

Rhetoric, in its general principles, applied to Preaching—Invention and Style : and the Pastoral Office—in itself considered; the Pastor as a Man—in his Relations to Society, to the Church, in connection with Public Worship and the Care of Souls. The author recognizes intellectual qualifications, but he does not forget that the first requisite in the ambassador, is, that he must love Christ, and then those for whom Christ died, that he must be wholly consecrated to the work and present the Gospel in its fulness and purity. The work, is the ripe fruit of many years study. The suggestions and discussions are presented with great clearness and order, and although we may not regard some things in the light in which he does, writing from a Congregational stand-point, the book is a useful and valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

Notes, Critical and Explanatory on the Acts of the Apostles. By Melancthon W. Jacobus, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. We have been long familiar with the labors of Dr. Jacobus, as an expositor of the Scriptures, and the results of his investigation on this important Book detract nothing from his well-earned reputation in this direction.

History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence. By Henry C. Fish, D. D. Two volumes in one. New York: M. W. Dodd. We are glad to see a new edition of this work, originally published in 1856, but for some time out of print. Here are found the master-pieces of Pulpit eloquence, selected from such writers as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Barrow, Hall, Chalmers, Edwards, Davies, Mason and others, with discourses from Chrysostom, Augustine, Wickliffe, Knox, Latimer and other eminent divines. Some of which are in this work, for the first time presented in an English dress. In connection with the German Pulpit, are given illustrations of Luther, Melancthon, Spener, Zollikoffer, Herder, Reinhard, Schleiermacher, Harms and Theremin. Accompanying these selections are historical sketches of preaching in the different countries represented, and biographical and critical notices of the several preachers and their discourses.

Lamps, Pitchers and Trumpets, Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher. Illustrated by Anecdotes, Biographical, Historical, and Elucidatory, of every order of Pulpit Eloquence, from the Great Preachers of all Ages. New York: M. W. Dodd. This volume is composed of Lectures, delivered at Mr. Spurgeon's College for young men with the ministry in view, and is not intended to be a systematic treatise, but a range over a wide field in connection with the subject of preaching. The title is taken from the narrative of Gideon, who divided his three hundred men into three companies, putting a trumpet in every man's right hand and a pitcher in the other, and a lamp within the pitcher; so "words" says the author, are "lamps, pitchers and trumpets," as a lamp giving light to the intellect, as a trumpet, arousing the conscience from its slumber, and as a pitcher bearing refreshment to the heart. The book contains many interesting things, well told.

Son of Man. Discourses on the Humanity of Jesus Christ. By Frank Coulin, D. D. Minister of the Notional Church of Geneva. Translated with the sanction of the Author. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. These discourses, (1) Jesus of Nazareth;

(2) The Holy One and Just ; (3) The man of Sorrows ; (4) The Risen One ; (5) The King ; (6) The Teaching of Jesus Christ—are well translated. They are popular in style, evangelical in spirit, and present old subjects in a new phase.

The Old Testament History. From the Creation to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. Edited by William Smith, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. This work meets a long felt want, which seems to leave nothing in its way to be desired. The matter is full, thorough and erudite, and presented in clear, condensed and elegant language. In addition to the Old Testament History with notes, references and citations, the volume furnishes an account of each of the Books of the Bible, the geography of the Holy Land and related countries, with the political and ecclesiastical antiquities of the Jews.

A Commentary on the Confession of Faith. With Questions for Theological Students and Bible Classes. By A. A. Hodge, D. D. Professor in the Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Extraordinary care and much labor are evinced in the preparation of this Commentary, and it must prove of great value to theological students and ministers of the Gospel, in the study of the Confession of Faith. It consists of an exhaustive analysis of the great Standard of the Presbyterian Church, with Scriptural proofs and illustrations, accompanied with a series of questions for the convenience of teachers and pupils.

The Christian Worker. A call to the Laity. By Rev. Charles F. Beach. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This work has been written in sympathy with earnest effort among all God's people, for the conversion of the world, the ministry itself being regarded by the author as inadequate to the work. The discussion embraces the following points : (1) The Gospel of Christ, a Dispensation of Mercy to the World ; (2) Every Disciple of Christ, a Preacher of His Gospel ; (3) The Necessity of Lay Preaching ; (4) The Preparation for the Work ; (5) The Manner of Performing it ; (6) Incentives to Faithfulness in the Discharge of the Duty ; (7) The Time to Commence the Work ; (8) The Reward of Fidelity.

Remarkable Facts : Illustrative and Confirmatory of Different Portions of Holy Scripture. By Rev. J. Leifchild, D. D. With a Preface by his Son. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The design of the work, is to elucidate Scripture by the facts of human experience. It abounds in interesting incident and graphic narrative, and its perusal will be productive of benefit.

The Life of Samuel Miller, D. D., LL. D. Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, N. J. By Samuel Miller. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This record of the long, useful and honored career of an eminent divine, in the Presbyterian Church, will be welcomed and read with interest, not only by the members of his own denomination, but by Christians of every name. He was a good man, faithful in the discharge of his varied duties, laborious and untiring in his efforts to do good, and, by all who were brought into relations, was regarded with great reverence and love. The volumes are replete with information, and furnish a history of the times in the Presbyterian Church for more than half a century.

Dr. Martin Luther's House Postil, or Sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays and Principal Festivals of the Church Year. Translated from the German. Vol. I. Columbus, O. Schulze & Gassman. This is a most valuable contribution to our ecclesiastical literature, and its appearance should be regarded with interest not only by the Lutheran Church, but by Christians of every name. It is proper, that the earnest truths, uttered in his own dwelling, by the gifted Reformer, which, in the original, have cheered and strengthened so many hearts, should be given to the public in an English form. Since the days of Paul no man ever expounded God's word with so much simplicity and power. He speaks with force and fidelity. He is always natural and impressive. Although it is difficult to reproduce Luther's peculiar style, the translators, Prof. E. Schmid and Rev. D. M. Martens, have been remarkably successful in their work. We trust that the work will meet with such encouragement, that the publication of the other volumes, necessary to complete the series, will not be delayed.

Life and Deeds of Dr. Martin Luther. By Rev. Hermann Fick. Translated from the German by Rev. M. Loy. Columbus, O. J. A. Schulze. The prominent events in the Life of the Great Reformer are here presented in a connected and condensed form, in a manner adapted to interest and instruct the young. The translation by Professor Loy is idiomatic and graceful.

The Doctrine of Justification. By Rev. M. Loy, A. M. Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Columbus, O. Columbus: J. A. Schulze. This is a full and able discussion of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, highly creditable to the author. It is presented with great earnestness, and in plain, lucid and vigorous language. However much some may differ from the writer on a few points, all will admire the ability and excellent spirit, with which the discussion is conducted.

Questions on the Gospels for the Church Year. By E. Greenwald, D. D. Vol. I. Lancaster, Pa. School Association of the Church of the Holy Trinity. This is a good Question Book. It goes thoroughly into the examination of every lesson and brings out its leading points. It cannot fail to render service to those, for whom it is specially designed.

Chips from a German Workshop. By Max Muller, M. A. In Two Volumes, New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This is an admirable work by a man of patient study, profound research and varied attainments. It is an attractive and valuable English periodical. The first volume consists of essays on the Science of Religion. Religion is regarded as the deepest interest of humanity, and the study of the world's religion as offering one of the most important fields for studying the history of the human race. The second volume gives discussions on Mythology, Traditions and Customs. We differ from the author in some of his views on the doctrines, practices and religious institutions of India and China, and think that he sometimes rationalizes too much, yet no one can read the volumes without delight and instruction.

Women's Suffrage; The Reform against Nature. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This book is worthy of thoughtful examination. The discussion is able, comprehensive and thorough, and ought to settle the question in the minds of intel-

ligent Christians. The fundamental theory of the author is, that the nature of the one sex is complementary to the other, and that those who would obliterate these natural distinctions would mar the charms of life, and destroy the religious sanctities of home. He takes hold of this great social problem and discusses it with great vigor, clearly showing the fallacies which underlie the arguments of those who would extend to woman the elective franchise, and fully demonstrating that the reform, which they seek, is opposed to her own nature and the manifest ordination of God.

Bible Wonders. By Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Dr. Newton is one of our most successful instructors of the young on religious subjects. In the present volume texts of Scripture are aptly selected and skilfully illustrated by incidents and anecdotes of ancient and modern history, and by the discoveries of the Microscope and Telescope.

Little Effie's Home. By the author of "Donald Frazier," etc. New York: Carter & Brothers. Our friend Peter Carter is doing good service by his simple, natural stories, so excellent in their illustration of Bible truth, and written in the interest of the youthful reader. Little Effie's curious sayings will aid him in the clearer comprehension of the life and work of the twelve disciples.

American Edition of Dr. Wm. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D.D. With the co-operation of Ezra Abbott, LL.D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. This valuable edition of Dr. Smith's Dictionary, so often commended in our *Quarterly*, has reached Part XIX, which concludes with an elaborate article on the New Testament.

The English Version of the New Testament and the Marginal Readings. By Charles F. Schaeffer, D.D. Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Phila. Andover: W. F. Draper. This is an able, elaborate and valuable production, indicating in its preparation great industry and laborious research on the part of the author, who gives an interesting history of the various translations of the Bible into English, and illustrates his subject by the selection and careful examination of the Epistle to the Romans.

In Memoriam. Death and Funeral Obsequies of Rev. W. V. Gotwald, late Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Lancaster, Pa. Also a Sermon of Deceased, preached on the First Sunday of January, 1869. Published by the Church Council. Lancaster, Pa. Rauch & Cochran.

The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By G. F. Krotel, D.D. Philadelphia Lutheran Book Store.

The Decoration of the Soldiers' Graves, Preached in St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Easton, May 30th, 1869. By Rev. J. H. Barclay, D.D. Easton, Pa. Wood and Bunsteen.

Courageous Thankfulness. Twentieth Pastoral Anniversary, July 14, 1869. St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C. J. Geo. Butler, D.D. Washington, D. C. Judd & Detweiler.

Dr. Martin Luther's Church-Postil. Sermons on the Epistles. Comprising a Sermon on the Epistles for the different Sundays and Festivals in the Year. Translated from the German. New Market, Va. Lutheran Publication Society.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXX.

Article.	Page
<p>I. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. ARTICLE FOURTH OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION,.....</p> <p>By MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.</p>	481
<p>II. THE SABBATH QUESTION IN ITS HISTORICAL RELATIONS, AND BEARINGS UPON THE FAITH AND LIFE OF THE CHURCH,.....</p> <p>By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Phillipsburg, Pa.</p>	524
<p>III. COMMUNION WITH GOD,.....</p> <p>By J. FEW SMITH, D. D., NEWARK, N. J.</p>	556
<p>IV. ECCLESIASTICAL PURITY,.....</p> <p>By Rev. H. L. DOX, Gasport, N. Y.</p>	565
<p>V. DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES,.....</p> <p>By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	579
<p>VI. THE RELATION OF THE TEXT TO THE SERMON. BY DR. KAHLE, PASTOR AT CAYMEN. TRANS- LATED FROM THE GERMAN.....</p> <p>By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Ind.</p>	597
<p>VII. PATRICK HENRY,.....</p> <p>By W. B. SPRAGUE, D. D., LL. D., Albany, N. Y.</p>	611
<p>VIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....</p>	636

The Evangelical Quarterly Review edited by Prof. M. L. Stoever, for July gives eight articles: (1) Sacramental Presence, Rev. C. Thomas; (2) The Keys, Rev. G. H. N. Peters; (3) The Will, Rev. Allen Traver; (4) Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers; (5) The Lord's Supper, Rev. J. B. Gross; (6) The Christian Church, Rev. E. J. Wolf; (7) The German Colony and Lutheran Church in Maine, Rev. H. N. Pohlman, D. D.; (8) The Special Mission of the Lutheran Publication Society, Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg. Dr. Pohlman's article will be found to contain facts of unusual interest.—*Congregationalist and Boston Recorder*.

Several articles are worthy of special attention, but that on "The German Colony and Lutheran Church in Maine," is of much more than denominational interest. It was delivered before the Historical Society of the Lutheran Church at Washington, D. C., a few weeks since, by Rev. Dr. Pohlman, of Albany.—*New York Evangelist*.

This is the organ of the Lutheran Church, edited by Prof. M. L. Stoever, LL. D., of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg. Prof. Stoever's name is an assurance that his *Quarterly* will be characterized by the best ability he can command, and that it will not be deficient in Christian courtesy. Almost every number contains at least one article, representative of other denominations than his own.—*National Baptist*.

We have been an attentive reader of this *Quarterly*, edited by Dr. M. L. Stoever, for ten years. It has been to us an equivalent of, at least, two years study in Theology. The most important and vital questions of the Christian Church and world are treated by it in a most masterly manner. We know of no publication, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or book, that furnishes more material for reflection, investigation or study, to the learner of Gospel truths.—*The Educator*.

We have on our table the July number of the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Prof. M. L. Stoever, and published at Gettysburg, Pa. The *Review* has attained to its XXth Volume, and has been steadily increasing in interest and popularity. The July number presents unusual attractions, being freighted with articles on topics of the deepest interest, by some of the ablest writers of our Church.—*Lutheran Observer*.

We regard this number as one of more than ordinary interest.—*American Lutheran*.



GTU Library



3 2400 00255 4669

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

v.20
1869

19271
Evangelical quarterly
review /

19271



GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

